

★
No 9335.4a75 bb

Communist
Party



GIVEN BY

U. S. SUPT. OF DOCUMENTS

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

(Communist Party)

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. Res. 5

TO INVESTIGATE (1) THE EXTENT, CHARACTER, AND
OBJECTS OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN
THE UNITED STATES, (2) THE DIFFUSION WITHIN THE
UNITED STATES OF SUBVERSIVE AND UN-AMERICAN PROP-
AGANDA THAT IS INSTIGATED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES
OR OF A DOMESTIC ORIGIN AND ATTACKS THE PRINCIPLE
OF THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT AS GUARANTEED BY
OUR CONSTITUTION, AND (3) ALL OTHER QUESTIONS IN
RELATION THERETO THAT WOULD AID CONGRESS IN ANY
NECESSARY REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

SEPTEMBER 26, 27, OCTOBER 17, 18, 19, 1945
AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1946

71
9325-4425
APR 25 1946

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia, *Chairman*

JOHN E. RANKIN, Mississippi

I. HARDIN PETERSON, Florida

I. W. ROBINSON, Utah

JOHN R. MURDOCK, Arizona

HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina

J. PARNELL THOMAS, New Jersey

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota

GERALD W. LANDIS, Indiana

ERNIE ADAMSON, *Counsel*

JOHN W. CARRINGTON, *Clerk*

APPENDIX

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *Wednesday, September 26, 1945.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The committee met in Executive Session at 10:02 o'clock a. m., Hon. John E. Rankin presiding.

Mr. RANKIN. Proceed, Mr. Adamson.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will bring Mr. Browder in. He was out here a few minutes ago. (Mr. Wood, chairman of the committee, took the chair.)

Mr. RANKIN. Let the Sergeant come in. Let the policeman come in.

(A Capitol policeman conferred with Mr. Rankin.)

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder is outside. I think you definitely want to call him first.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

(Mr. Earl Russell Browder entered the committee room.)

Mr. ADAMSON. This is Mr. Browder, gentlemen, who was subpoenaed here.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Browder, will you please take the witness stand?

Mr. ADAMSON. We are going to hear you in executive session temporarily, Mr. Browder. Will you be sworn?

TESTIMONY OF EARL RUSSELL BROWDER, YONKERS, NEW YORK

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, will you give your full name and office address and home address?

Mr. BROWDER. Earl Russell Browder. Home address, 7 Highland Place, Yonkers, N. Y. I have no office address at the present time.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, when was your last appearance here before the old Special Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe it was in September 1939.

Mr. ADAMSON. And at that time did you hold any position with any political organization?

Mr. BROWDER. I was the Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. ADAMSON. And how long have you held that position?

Mr. BROWDER. Since 1930.

Mr. ADAMSON. How long did you hold that position after 1939?

Mr. BROWDER. Until the dissolution of the Communist Party in May 1944.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will you tell the committee the circumstances that led up to the dissolution that you have just mentioned?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't understand the question.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, what was the moving impulse behind the dissolution of the party? In other words, why did you dissolve it?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, it is a matter of public record. I don't think I could add anything to that record.

Mr. ADAMSON. Since you were the secretary—and I assume you were the principal executive officer—would you tell us in your own words about that? Probably these gentlemen did not read all the newspaper and magazine articles on the subject.

Mr. BROWDER. I would prefer to answer a question of that kind by giving you the official documents, if you do not have them in the record. I don't like to handle such questions by restating in my own words matters which are matters of public record, actions by public bodies, political conventions.

Mr. ADAMSON. By what authority or what action was the party dissolved?

Mr. BROWDER. By action of the convention.

Mr. ADAMSON. And how do you take that to be a matter of public record?

Mr. BROWDER. The action of the convention was taken on a report which I made, which dealt with the question very thoroughly.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you have a copy of your report here?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not. I didn't bring any document with me. I was not informed in any way what was expected of me. I could furnish it, though.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well. You can furnish that at a later date. Since you do not have the report here, suppose you tell us the principal grounds upon which you recommended such action. I take it that your report recommended the dissolution to the convention. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. It did.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, tell us the principal reason, in your own mind.

Mr. BROWDER. The principal reason—I would say reason—was to endeavor to make a contribution to the national unity required for the running of the war, by demonstrating a nonpartisan approach to the problems of the Nation.

Mr. ADAMSON. How large is your report, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. It was published as a pamphlet, I believe, in about 48 small pages. Probably that would be the equivalent of about 36 book pages.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you say there were any political considerations involved in the dissolution of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I consider that what I have stated is the main consideration. It is deeply political.

Mr. ADAMSON. And would you say that the winning of the war was the controlling impulse behind your report?

Mr. BROWDER. That was the moving concept of the whole report.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was that impulse present in your mind prior to the time of the attack by the German Army on Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. No more than it was in the minds of the leaders of the Nation.

Mr. ADAMSON. Can't you tell us whether it was or was not, Mr. Browder, since we can't tell what was in the minds of the leaders of the Nation? We don't have them all here.

Mr. BROWDER. I think we have the record. I only speak about the record. I don't pretend to read anyone's mind, but it is a matter of record that America, through its duly constituted leadership, did not assume the burden of winning the war until America declared war.

Mr. ADAMSON. When the party was dissolved through action of your convention and pursuant to the recommendations contained in your report, did you form another organization to take its place?

Mr. BROWDER. The delegates who had taken the action to dissolve the Communist Party reconstituted themselves into a new constituent convention for the formation of the Communist Political Association, a nonparty organization engaging in political life on a nonparty basis.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does that mean that you attempted to nominate candidates for public office as an association?

Mr. BROWDER. We intended to associate ourselves with the broad, progressive currents in the country, and together with them help to nominate and elect candidates. One of the main reasons for the change from party to association was to remove the Communists from the direct problem of the nomination of candidates.

Mr. ADAMSON. Should we understand, then, that the objectives of your association were to affiliate themselves with other parties and support other candidates, rather than to function as a political party?

Mr. BROWDER. Affiliations were left as a matter entirely for the individuals who were in charge, and the association as such never made any affiliation. It merely represented the grouping of the political thinking of its members, and not an organizational alignment with any other body.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then a member of your Association could, in fact, be an enrolled Democrat or enrolled Republican at the same time?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMSON. You adopted no rule or regulation in the association that would be inconsistent with membership in another political party at the same time? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was that true with regard to the Communist Party organization before it was dissolved?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that was not true before the dissolution of the Communist Party.

Mr. RANKIN. Have you a copy of the constitution of the Communist Party before the dissolution; a copy of the constitution or the platform?

Mr. BROWDER. I could provide it for the committee. I have provided it before many Government bodies in the past and will, although now I am a private citizen and have no authority in the party.

Mr. RANKIN. Will you supply a copy for the record at this point?

Mr. BROWDER. I will try to see that it is supplied. I do not have them myself.

Mr. RANKIN. Can you tell us where to get one?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, in order to keep the record straight then, I ask that a copy of Mr. Browder's report to the convention in 1944 be marked "Exhibit 1," to be submitted, and that the copy of the constitution suggested by Mr. Rankin be marked "Exhibit 2."

Mr. RANKIN. Don't you think you ought to have it reversed?

Mr. ADAMSON. It doesn't make any difference. I say one because he mentioned the report first.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the constitution ought to come first, and then his report recommending dissolution should follow.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well; then may I mark the constitution exhibit 1, and Mr. Browder's report to the convention exhibit 2?

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

(The constitution of the Communist Party was marked "Exhibit 1," and Mr. Browder's report to the convention was marked "Exhibit 2," and received in evidence.)

Mr. PETERSON. Will you ask him did the same delegates organize the association that had been delegates in the party convention?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes. With regard to the convention of delegates—by "convention" I mean of 1944—did those delegates continue to sit then as delegates constituting a convention of the association?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. There was no change in the delegation as a whole?

Mr. BROWDER. There were some individuals who had not been associated with the Communist Party who then associated themselves with the convention and took part in the proceedings. They were not a very large number but they made a distinct difference. I could not say that the two conventions were identical in their constitution.

Mr. ADAMSON. But with the exception of small changes in the personnel, it was the same?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you say that a great majority of the delegates were the same?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Browder, about how many delegates were there at that meeting that were new?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not answer that offhand with any degree of accuracy. I would say that it was a relatively small number compared to the body of the convention.

Mr. THOMAS. And would you name some of those new delegates?

Mr. BROWDER. When it is a question of identifying people in a convention, I would prefer to rely on the printed record. It has been published.

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then may I ask the witness to submit that at this point in the record and mark it "Exhibit 3," Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you do that?

Mr. BROWDER. I think you can get all of this material in one exhibit. I can give you the printed record of the convention, which contains my report, the constitution, a summary of all proceedings, and the names of officials and delegations.

Mr. THOMAS. Does it indicate who the new delegates are?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe it does; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Does it indicate the new delegates? If it does not indicate who the new delegates are, will you indicate in there who the new delegates are?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not promise to give you any accurate information on that, because it would be purely a question of memory a long time after.

Mr. THOMAS. You have got a pretty good memory.

Mr. BROWDER. To the extent that this information would be present in my mind, it will be in that document. It is a considerable book, and in that single exhibit you will have the complete record of that convention.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you have the book with you?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not. I did not bring any documents with me. It has been published. The copies are available. I could give you a copy when I get back to New York.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you try to indicate in the book who the new delegates are?

Mr. BROWDER. I think the contents of the book will indicate that.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the name of that book?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't remember what title was given to the book. It was some broad, political slogan like "For Progress and Victory," or something like that. But the subject title, which is the essence of it, is the "Proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of the Communist Political Association."

Mr. THOMAS. Will you see that that is supplied for the record?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, sir. Now, Mr. Browder, does this book cover the proceedings both of the party convention before its dissolution and then the proceedings of the association convention immediately after the dissolution of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; the record of the dissolution of the Communist Party is included in the book as a matter of information.

(The Book referred to was marked "Exhibit 3," and received in evidence.)

Mr. ADAMSON. Is the association incorporated, or is it a membership association?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a membership association.

Mr. ADAMSON. And are you registered anywhere as a political association?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. You have not attempted to register the name anywhere?

Mr. BROWDER. No. The association was recorded in the institution of the Congress supervising electoral processes. They made a regular report to both the House and Senate committees on the electoral campaign expenditures.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you say that the formation of the association permitted a much broader membership than the old party did among the American voters?

Mr. BROWDER. It was conceded in the convention that that was one of the ideas that was in mind.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you explain to the committee the difference in party line policy between the activities of the Communist Party before its dissolution and the association which was subsequently organized?

Mr. BROWDER. I have already explained that. There is another difference beyond what I have already stated.

Mr. ADAMSON. The association then recommended or advocated the same policies as the old Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; in political essence and in every important respect, aside from that which I explained, the association was the same as the party.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you have, or did you have, associated with the party a man named Jack Stachel?

Mr. BROWDER. Jack Stachel was at one time a member of the party. I don't know whether he was doing that during the whole period as a member of the party or not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was he a member of the party at the time the convention took this action of dissolution?

Mr. BROWDER. I really don't know.

Mr. ADAMSON. What was Mr. Stachel's official position with the party?

Mr. BROWDER. According to my recollection he did not have any official connection for many years.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, he did have some duties or activities in the way of publicity and public relations, did he not?

Mr. BROWDER. He was employed by a newspaper, the Daily Worker, for some time. I don't know exactly the terms of his employment.

Mr. ADAMSON. Is the Daily Worker still the mouthpiece or the organ of the association, of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is a matter of opinion and interpretation. One can not answer such a question offhand. The Daily Worker is the property of a corporation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Browder knows perfectly well the answer to that question. He doesn't seem to remember the question. I think he ought to be just as fair as he possibly can with this committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. I have just two more questions, Mr. Chairman. In other words, I want to cover as many things as I can before we reach that point.

How long have you known Mr. Stachel, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. A good many years.

Mr. ADAMSON. And has your acquaintance with him been entirely through the party or the association, or is he a personal friend of yours?

Mr. BROWDER. Through the association and in political activities.

Mr. ADAMSON. You say "a good many years." Would you put that back before 1930, or subsequent to 1930?

Mr. BROWDER. I am sure that I have had contacts with him in political activities before 1930.

Mr. ADAMSON. All through the Communist Party? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And what were his duties or activities then, Mr. Browder, did you know?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not be able to tell you offhand.

Mr. ADAMSON. And is he a member of the association at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. The association does not exist now.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was he prior to the convention in July?

Mr. BROWDER. I really think I should not be asked to identify particular persons in relation to membership.

Mr. ADAMSON. If you don't know——

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). When the information is directly available to the committee, and I am certainly not a unique channel through which the committee could get such information, and I would not like to have that burden placed upon me.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you know, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I do not. It would be a matter of memory, of opinion. I don't like to give opinions before a body of this kind.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you know Benjamin J. Davis?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. He is a member of the City Council of New York from Harlem? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And do you know whether or not Davis is a member of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I assume that he is, but I can not state as a matter of knowledge.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you know Davis through his contacts and your contacts in the Communist organizations, or do you know him personally?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. You know him personally?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Adamson, there is one question you have not asked. That is whether or not Mr. Browder is a member of the Communist Party now.

Mr. ADAMSON. I expected to ask him about the recent history of the party, Mr. Rankin, and if he is a member of the new organization.

Mr. RANKIN. He said the association had been abolished.

Mr. ADAMSON. In July, that is right. Mr. Browder, you had a convention in New York this summer, I believe. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, in July.

Mr. ADAMSON. And at that convention what action was taken? I believe that was called as a convention of the Communist Association?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Political Association, according to its constitution, called a special convention. This convention made a decision to revise the constitution and by-laws, to change the name of the association to the "Communist Party."

Mr. ADAMSON. You said in the beginning of your testimony that you——

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). What revision was made? Find that out.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well. You said in the beginning of your testimony that you were formerly the secretary of the Communist Party. Now, will you tell

us what difference exists today between the reconstituted party and the party which existed prior to May 1944?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not an official of the Communist Party as reconstituted in the July convention.

Mr. ADAMSON. Are you a member of the new Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I am a member.

Mr. ADAMSON. And if you are a member, Mr. Browder, you certainly know what the new party stands for; do you not?

Mr. BROWDER. I know the action of the convention.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well; can you tell the committee what, if any, difference exists between the new party and the old party?

Mr. BROWDER. The difference that exists is that the change which took place in May 1944 was reversed in July 1945.

Mr. RANKIN. Completely reversed?

Mr. BROWDER. The only change that was made in 1944 was the abolition of the strictly political party features of the organization, the naming of candidates and so forth, and the relation to other political organizations. Those changes, which were the only substantial changes made in 1944, were reversed in 1945.

Mr. RANKIN. And the theory and objects of the Communist Party now is exactly what it was prior to 1944?

Mr. BROWDER. In all political substance it is the same as the Communist Political Association and the Communist Party as it existed before the formation of the association.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I think we have reached the point where we want to open the meeting to a public hearing.

Mr. ADAMSON. Before we do that, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that Mr. Browder communicate with whoever he wishes in New York and obtain copies of the documents, of the book that he has referred to here. He ought to be able to have it here tomorrow morning.

Mr. RANKIN. And the new constitution of the Communist Party.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think probably he could obtain all of those for us and have them here tomorrow morning. How about that, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I would prefer that you find some other way of getting all of the documents, the documents which contain my report of 1944. I would be glad to furnish it myself, but I would not like to undertake to become a general information bureau to gather documents with which I have no direct connection.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say a while ago, Mr. Browder, that this book that contains the constitution and proceedings of the convention was available.

Mr. BROWDER. They were published and sold.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it available to you?

Mr. BROWDER. I have certainly one copy of it in my library. It was published and sold in the public book stores.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you call your home and have them send it?

Mr. BROWDER. I said I will undertake to give you a copy of that book.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you have it here in the morning for us?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not certain that I can get it by tomorrow, but I can have it for you within a few days. Certainly I can have it for you as soon as I get back to New York.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us open the meeting, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWDER. You will find it in the Library of Congress.

Mr. ADAMSON. We want a copy of it for the record, of course.

Mr. BROWDER. But if you want immediate reference, you can get it from the Library of Congress immediately.

Mr. RANKIN. We want it to go into this record.

Mr. BROWDER. And I will see that you get it.

Mr. RANKIN. You stated that the change came just this last summer, when the Communist Party was re-constituted. Did you leave the organization then?

Mr. BROWDER. I was not elected. I was not a delegate to that convention. I was present only in my capacity as past president.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I think we should open the meeting now.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

(Whereupon, at 11 a. m. the executive session was concluded and the committee proceeded in open session.)

INVESTIGATION OF UNAMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *Wednesday, September 26, 1945.*

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. John E. Rankin presiding.

Mr. RANKIN. The committee will come to order. We will go into Executive Session.

(Whereupon, at 10:01 a. m., the committee went into executive session.)

(At 11 the committee resumed the public hearing, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.)

The CHAIRMAN. We will proceed.

TESTIMONY OF EARL RUSSELL BROWDER, YONKERS, N. Y.

(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairman.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Browder, what is your business?

Mr. BROWDER. I am a journalist, a writer and author, and economist. I have been an accountant in the past—a glorified name for a bookkeeper.

Mr. BONNER. For whom did you work as an accountant? Who employed you?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I have not been employed in that capacity for some 30 years—28 years.

Mr. BONNER. Who was your last employer?

Mr. BROWDER. The last place where I was employed was Sam Stagg and Hilder Bros., importers and exporters, New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. We will suspend for a few minutes while the people come in. There will be no pictures made here without the approval of the committee, and that has not been given, gentlemen.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not afraid of having them take pictures. I think it is very unusual if they do not take them.

Mr. ADAMSON (committee counsel). Have you any objection to having photographs made, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a matter of complete indifference to me.

Mr. ADAMSON. The witness says he is indifferent about it.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the photographers be allowed to take pictures.

Mr. MURDOCK. I second the motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Let them take whatever pictures they want to now, and then let us proceed with the hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been moved and seconded that the photographers be permitted to proceed to take pictures.

Mr. RANKIN. At the present time?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I said at any time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to agree to that. I am willing to suspend here and let the photographers take pictures and then let us proceed with the investigation. I move to amend the motion that they be permitted to take what pictures they want to now, and then leave.

Mr. THOMAS. I will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. You have heard the motion as amended.

(The motion was put and carried.)

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, ladies and gentlemen, at the present time pictures can be taken.

(Flashlight photographs were then taken.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we suspend with the taking of pictures and proceed with the investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. JOSEPH R. BRODSKY. Mr. Chairman, I represent Mr. Davis, and I am requesting that you call Mr. Davis first as a witness. I would like to state why.

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRODSKY. Mr. Davis is engaged in a hard campaign—

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). A point of order, Mr. Chairman. This man is interrupting the proceedings of the committee. I demand that the rule be enforced and that he be either compelled to take his seat or be removed from the committee room.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, the committee does not recognize counsel in these hearings. So far as the chairman is concerned, there is no objection to your remaining through the testimony, but without the right to participate in the proceedings.

Mr. BRODSKY. I am not participating. I am making a request on behalf of a witness who has been subpoenaed here, and I wish the gentlemen would have the courtesy to let me finish my statement. Then you can rule on it.

The CHAIRMAN. I have ruled on it. If you desire to remain, you are at liberty to do so. May I inquire who you are?

Mr. BRODSKY. Joseph R. Brodsky.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the right to remain. We will proceed. I might call the attention of the audience to the fact that there will be no demonstration permitted in this room. We will conduct the examination in an orderly way. We are glad to have you present as long as you concur with that rule.

Proceed, Mr. Adamson.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, you have agreed to produce records and documents concerning the dissolution of the Communist Party in May 1944, and the reconstitution of the party in July of this year. Do you think you can have those records here tomorrow morning?

Mr. BROWDER. May I make a slight correction? I said that I will provide the committee with a copy of the published book containing the full record of the convention of the Communist political association in May 1944, including my report, and the constitution, which was the specific subject of inquiry. I have not said that I can furnish the committee with any other documents besides that one, which is a comprehensive and inclusive document.

Mr. ADAMSON. Were you an officer of the association?

Mr. BROWDER. I was the president.

Mr. ADAMSON. And are you an officer at this time of the Communist Party as reconstituted?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not.

Mr. ADAMSON. And is your position as stated here due to the fact that you were an officer of the old party and of the association, but you are not an officer of the new party? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't understand your question.

Mr. ADAMSON. What is the reason for your reluctance to provide the committee with the documents in the records concerning the convention in July of this year?

Mr. BROWDER. I feel that it is my function to supply information only on those things for which I was directly responsible.

Mr. ADAMSON. And the reason is, then, that you are not an officer at this time and you were an officer of the association and the old party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you prefer that someone else be called upon to produce those records?

Mr. BROWDER. That is incorrect. I would not put it that way, though. I don't say that I would prefer that anybody should be called. Perhaps it would be better if nobody was called unless we would have a real investigation of merit and not a smear campaign.

Mr. ADAMSON. Can you tell us—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Just a moment. We will have no insinuations that anybody is seeking to smear anybody in the hearing.

Mr. BROWDER. And perhaps you will warn the counsel also not to make any insinuations in his questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I will; if he does.

Mr. BROWDER. Very well. I am willing to submit to the same rulings that counsel does.

Mr. ADAMSON. What contacts or instructions did you have at any time prior to the convention in May 1944, with any persons or groups of persons outside the United States, dealing with the dissolution of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. None whatever.

Mr. ADAMSON. And did you receive any communications or any representatives dealing with that subject prior to May 1944?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. Any of the reports that you made to the convention in May 1944, are based solely upon your own conclusions?

Mr. BROWDER. No; it was a collective conclusion of the leadership of the Communist Party.

Mr. ADAMSON. Could you explain a little more fully what you mean by "collective conclusion?"

Mr. BROWDER. I thought it was a matter of every-day knowledge of all persons engaged in politics that political decisions involving political parties and organizations are never individual decisions, that they are the result of consultation of members and leaders, and therefore can never be placed as individual decisions.

Mr. ADAMSON. And the dissolution, then, of the party in May 1944, was based upon, would you say, the consensus of opinion of the leaders of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. And of the membership.

Mr. ADAMSON. And your report was merely a summary of their opinion? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. It was the representation of that collective opinion.

Mr. ADAMSON. And what contact, if any, did your convention have with any international Communist organization—and now I speak of your convention of May 1944?

Mr. BROWDER. The organized Communist movement under whatever form or name has had no organizational contacts outside of the United States since November 1940.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it have now?

Mr. BROWDER. I cannot answer about anything except for the period in which I was an official.

The CHAIRMAN. By that you mean that you don't know?

Mr. BROWDER. I mean that as a matter of principle I would not attempt to answer questions except on the basis of my personal knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I asked you. You don't know? Is that what we should understand?

Mr. BROWDER. Quite obviously, not being an official, I can not answer such questions, those questions of an official status that can only be answered by an official.

The CHAIRMAN. You can certainly answer that question, whether you know or not.

Mr. BROWDER. I have answered it.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not so understand it. Would you mind repeating the answer?

Mr. BROWDER. I have answered that that is a question of official status and therefore no one can know except an official. For other people it is hearsay.

The CHAIRMAN. That is an evasive answer. Would you mind telling me whether or not you know?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, for my own guidance, will it be your position here in this examination that you do not know with sufficient certainty the answers to any questions which deal with the policy or conduct of the Communist Party as now constituted? And by that I mean since the party took the place of the association at the convention in July of this last summer.

Mr. BROWDER. I could only answer that question when you establish what is the scope and purpose of this interrogation. As I understand it, this committee has no charge from the body which constituted it to investigate the political opinion of any citizen of the United States. It is to investigate facts, not opinions. That is my understanding. I am perfectly willing to answer questions about facts. I am not prepared under any circumstances to submit to this body an interrogation of political opinions.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, if you learn or are aware of certain facts, is it your position here that you do not wish to answer questions dealing with those facts, even though you know the answers, because you are not an official of the new Communist Party? I ask you that to shorten up the proceedings, because I do not want to spend time asking you questions which you say you do not wish to answer for that reason.

Mr. BROWDER. If it was your intention to proceed with a line of questioning designed to draw forth my political opinions about this, that and the other question, then I would say that I would refuse to answer such questions. I do not consider that it is within the scope of the authority of this Commission to investigate the political opinions of individual citizens.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Charman, I make a point of order that the witness is not being responsive to the questions. He is evading the questions and is talking about something now that counsel has not even touched upon.

The CHAIRMAN. I will call the attention of the witness to the fact that the committee will judge of its course and policy, and it is the province of the witness to answer questions asked him or refuse to answer them, in which event the committee will take such action with reference to it as seems advisable.

Mr. BROWDER. Also, it is the responsibility of the witness to answer questions upon the basis of his understanding of the law and of his own rights.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the photographers have asked that they be permitted to take one more picture of the crowd, and if there is no objection I ask unanimous consent that they may do so, provided they do so at once.

The CHAIRMAN. There seems to be no objection.

Mr. BROWDER. May I add to my previous answer—

Mr. ADAMSON (interposing). Wait just a minute while the pictures are taken.

(Pictures were here taken by the photographers.)

The CHAIRMAN. We will proceed.

Mr. BROWDER. May I add to my previous statement that when I say I will not answer questions designed to draw forth discussion of my political opinions, this should not be understood as in any way a desire to hide my opinions. It is a matter of principle as to the proper conduct of political discussions and where they should be conducted.

As far as making public my opinions, I have done this systematically throughout my life, and especially in the last 10 years. I have published not only innumerable newspaper articles to express those opinions, but further, I have published some 80 pamphlets and books which have reached a total circulation of 8,000,000 copies in this 10 years. Therefore I think it is clear that I am not hiding my opinions. My opinions have been broadcast as far as it has been possible to broadcast them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that any question that shows the motive of the witness in any activities that tended to be un-American are competent, and the witness should be required to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the competence of questions propounded to the witness will be ruled on by the committee. Proceed.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Browder, as I understood your previous answer, the Communist Party as reconstituted this year is in form and in substance the same as the party that was dissolved in May 1944. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the record of the convention involved.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you are not only a party member, you are an active party member and writer at the present time, are you not?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not active at the present time.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you continue to pursue your journalistic activities at the present time? I understood you to say that you did.

Mr. BROWDER. I answered the question as to what was my profession. I did not answer the question as to what I am doing at the present time. At the present time I am unemployed.

Mr. ADAMSON. And if the party is the same party in substance as the old party, then the scope of its activities would be the same as they were in 1940 or 1939? Isn't that true?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not say "yes" or "no."

Mr. ADAMSON. What is your understanding?

Mr. BROWDER. It simply does not follow. First let me make clear, you are asking me for my opinion and I do not believe that it is within the scope of any committee of Congress which is investigating facts to begin by asking a man's opinion.

Mr. ADAMSON. I am not asking you what you believe, Mr. Browder. I am asking you as a member of a party which you have told us is a political party now—I am asking you what you understand to be the principles of that party. As a member of the party do you mean to tell us that you don't know what those principles are?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. We merely want you to tell us what your understanding is. I am not asking you for hearsay evidence or political opinion, necessarily. Just tell us what you understand about the political party of which you are a member. Is it the same as the old party?

Mr. BROWDER. It is.

Mr. RANKIN. Ask him how far back does that go. Does that go back to the 20's, the 30's, 1932?

Mr. ADAMSON. I understood Mr. Browder to say earlier in his testimony that he became an active officer in 1930. I am going to ask him about his membership.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to know if it is the same as it was when it was hooked up with the Comintern.

Mr. ADAMSON. I expect to ask him those questions.

When did you first become a member of the party, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. 1921.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you became an officer of the party in about 1930? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Executive officer; yes, sir.

Mr. ADAMSON. Did you serve as any subordinate official of the party prior to 1930?

Mr. BROWDER. I have at various times been elected to the national committee for certain periods.

Mr. ADAMSON. You said a while ago that since 1940 the party had had no connection with any foreign organization or any international organization. Will you tell us what the situation was up to and including 1940 with regard to your international relationships?

Mr. BROWDER. Up until November 1940, for a period of years the Communist Party had been affiliated with the Communist Internationale, an international association of Communist parties in various countries. In November 1940, that affiliation was canceled at a special convention.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me ask, for what reason was it canceled?

Mr. ADAMSON. Where was that convention held?

Mr. BROWDER. The convention was held in New York.

Mr. ADAMSON. And at that convention were representatives present from the international organization?

Mr. BROWDER. No. There had been no practical connection with the international organization for several years.

Mr. ADAMSON. And did the international organization take any action of similar character?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, in May 1943, the Communist Internationale was dissolved—that is, in May 1943, a proposal was published that the Communist Internationale should be dissolved, and in June of that year that proposal was ratified by the parties which were members of the body which existed until that time.

Mr. ADAMSON. Did the international organization consist of the various Communist parties around in the different countries of the world?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And the Communist Party of the United States was one of the constituents of that international organization? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. For a period of some years, ending in November 1940.

Mr. ADAMSON. When did the Communist Party of the United States become an active participant in the Internationale?

Mr. BROWDER. It would be difficult for me to give you the answer with exactitude on that. I can give you the exact facts only from the time when I was responsible for those organizational relations, 1930 to 1940. There was active affiliation, which was recognized on both sides, that is, by the international organization and by the parties.

Mr. ADAMSON. On the matter of mechanics, Mr. Browder, how did that relationship function? In other words, what was the contact between your party here in the United States and the Internationale? I assume that you refer to the international headquarters in Moscow. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, tell us the mechanical contacts that you had with the Internationale in Moscow.

Mr. BROWDER. The international organization was composed of international congresses held at various intervals, not regularly fixed, to which delegates came from all the affiliated parties. These congresses discussed the problems of the world and hammered out a common understanding and approach to these questions. The congresses elected an executive committee for continuous exchange of information and discussion during the interval between congresses.

Mr. ADAMSON. When you refer to "congresses" do you mean meetings held in Moscow or do you mean meetings held in the various countries?

Mr. BROWDER. I am speaking of the congresses of the international delegations from these various countries, all of which in the history of the Internationale were held in Moscow.

Mr. ADAMSON. And the parties in the various countries then send delegates to this congress? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And were these congresses convened every year? Did you have a stated schedule?

Mr. BROWDER. There were seven congresses held in the life of the Communist Internationale, the last one being in the summer of 1935.

Mr. ADAMSON. Were you ever a delegate to these congresses?

Mr. BROWDER. I was.

Mr. ADAMSON. On how many occasions?

Mr. BROWDER. The last one, the 7th.

Mr. ADAMSON. That was in 1935?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Were you the only delegate?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. How large a delegation did the Communist Party of the United States send over?

Mr. BROWDER. Offhand I would say it must have been 15 or 16 members.

Mr. ADAMSON. And did you all go over together or did you travel separately?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't remember.

Mr. ADAMSON. How long did you remain in Moscow, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. During the period of the Congress.

Mr. ADAMSON. How long a period was that?

Mr. BROWDER. It was several weeks. I don't remember exactly. It is a matter of public record. It can easily be looked up if it is important.

Mr. ADAMSON. You don't recall?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I do not. It was several weeks.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, at the congress at which you were a delegate, what was the nature of the subjects of discussion, insofar as they related to the United States? I mean the character of the subjects.

Mr. BROWDER. The general character of the discussions in all aspects were dominated by the rising danger of war and how to oppose it, how to avoid the war that was threatening, due to the rise of Hitler to power in Germany. Generally, the subject of mobilizing all possible forces for the struggle against the threat of German nazism or fascism.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question there. As I understand it, Mr. Browder, the Communist Party in the United States had at a later date than 1935 referred to the war as an imperialist war. Furthermore, they were advocating—the Communist Party throughout the world were supporting the nonaggression pact between Germany and Russia. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know what you mean by your question. If one is to pass judgment upon a very important historical period, I don't think it can be done in an offhand fashion.

Mr. THOMAS. I simply refer to it because of your reference. Your statement of does not jibe with what actually happened after 1935.

Mr. BROWDER. It is a matter of public record that the opinion that I express is also at the present time the opinion of the most responsible leaders of public opinion in America and Britain. And the opinions which were held in 1939 and which were dominant at that time in America regarding the nonaggression pact, have since been revised fundamentally, except among a few extreme die-hard, anti-Soviet elements. It is generally understood today in the world that that pact was in the interest of America as well as of the Soviet Union.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not referring so much to the pact. I am referring to the statement made by you, and also the statement made by other leading Communists, not only in this country but in other countries, to the effect that you referred to the war at first as an imperialist war. Isn't that true?

Mr. BROWDER. My statement a moment ago—please don't ask me to subscribe to your formulation.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not asking you to subscribe to my formulation or opinion. I am just asking you to answer "yes" or "no," if you personally did not refer to the war as an imperialist war.

Mr. BROWDER. I don't understand what relation that has to the question that I just answered.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, would you mind answering the question asked?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a little difficult for me to answer questions in an intelligible way when, in the midst of questioning about the purposes and the subjects of the 1935 congress, the question is thrown in as to whether, in 1940, I did not say that the war was an imperialist war.

Mr. THOMAS. I just happened to know that you did say it, and you can't deny it.

Mr. BROWDER. I certainly did not deny it. I want to know the connection with this question, and I want to request that questions should be of some consecutive nature if you expect me to answer them intelligently.

Mr. RANKIN. The statement was made by you a moment ago that the anti-aggression pact between Russia and Germany was considered just, I believe you said, or right, by the thinking people of the world, and, as a matter of fact, it was in effect at the time when Germany was at war with England and when public opinion in this country was backing England. I didn't want that statement to go unchallenged. I didn't know whether counsel caught that or not.

Mr. ADAMSON. I made a mental note of it, Mr. Rankin.

Now, Mr. Browder, to get the question and answer straight by Mr. Thomas, you do remember making the statement, approximately in 1940, about the imperialistic war, don't you?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. When you attended the convention in 1935, you say that the discussions were largely influenced by the fear or the threat of war in Europe? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And the war that you were afraid of was either between Germany and Russia or between Germany and other countries in Europe? Isn't that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And did the discussions contemplate war between Germany and the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. The discussions recognized that the danger of war involved every country in the world, and proceeded upon the assumption that when war broke out it would be impossible to stop it until it engulfed the whole world, and therefore that the struggle to prevent that war—or if it could not be prevented, to defeat the aggressor—had to be organized on a world scale, and that if it was not organized on a world scale there was the danger that the Nazis would conquer the world. That was the keynote of the 7th World Congress.

Mr. ADAMSON. You volunteered the observation a moment ago that the pact which was entered into between the Russian Government and the German Government was recognized as being in the interest or to the benefit of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. I wonder if you could tell the committee in what respects you regard that pact to be in the interest of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. It was in the interest of the United States because it enabled the Soviet Union to prepare sufficiently to defeat Hitler, and without that preparation Hitler might have conquered the Soviet Union, which would certainly have guaranteed his conquering America.

Mr. ADAMSON. And would you give substantially the same answer with regard to the Russian attack on Finland? Was the war on Finland also conducted in the interest of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And in what respect?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, may I propound an inquiry? The House meets in a few minutes. What time shall we meet tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN. That is subject to the will of the committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let us make it 10 o'clock.

Mr. RANKIN. I move that the committee do now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. LANDIS. I have two brief questions of Mr. Browder. Do you not think that the United States has the highest standard of living in the world?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. LANDIS. Then why did the Communists wish to destroy and change our system?

Mr. BROWDER. We do not—

Mr. DAVIS (interposing). Mr. Chairman, I am Councilman Davis of New York. I have just heard Mr. Rankin postpone this hearing now, or continue it, until

ten o'clock tomorrow morning. I want to protest that because I am here out of my campaign, and it is taking very valuable time from my work in New York, and I think that I should have an opportunity to testify and get it over with. Otherwise I will just be forced to brand this as a witch hunt to prevent me from testifying.

The CHAIRMAN. It doesn't matter what you brand it. We are not concerned with that.

Mr. RANKIN. That is contempt of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Rankin, you can hardly speak about contempt.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Rankin, the House meets at 12.

The CHAIRMAN. I shall make the announcement that under the rules of the House this committee cannot set while the House is in session.

Mr. DAVIS. I am speaking in consideration of my own situation in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate that, and we will accommodate you just as quickly as we can.

Mr. DAVIS. We tried to get you to agree to that this morning. We wanted you to let me testify first.

Mr. ROBINSON. Can we set a definite time when the witness can testify?

Mr. RANKIN. It looks to me as if we are going to be several days with the witness we have. So far as I am concerned, I am not willing to break in on him for anyone else.

Mr. DAVIS. I certainly do not expect Mr. Rankin to give any consideration to a Negro in this House.

Mr. RANKIN. I have said nothing about Negroes or anything concerning Negroes. I ask that he be fined for contempt.

Mr. DAVIS. You can move as you please.

Mr. RANKIN. We are going to run this committee in an orderly way.

Mr. DAVIS. This is just an attempt to defeat me in the election.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will determine as soon as we can get into executive session what we will do in order to take care of the witnesses.

Mr. DAVIS. You can do one good thing; just end this witch hunt.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not concerned with your opinions as to what we can do.

Mr. DAVIS. What does the committee propose that I do, stay here in the city for several days?

The CHAIRMAN. You will be notified of that.

Mr. DAVIS. I consider this a most un-American way of acting in this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is not concerned about your opinion of it.

Mr. BONNER. I think we should give some consideration to this man. You say you expect to have this witness on the stand for 2 or 3 days. Can't we notify this witness when we will hear him?

The CHAIRMAN. We can go into executive session and determine that in 10 minutes. The public hearing is now adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a. m., the committee went into executive session, at the conclusion of which the committee adjourned until 10 a. m., Thursday, September 27, 1945.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., Thursday, September 27, 1945.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that we go into executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 10:02 a. m., the committee went into executive session, at the conclusion of which, 10:25 a. m., the open hearing was resumed.)

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Adamson.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let the record show that the committee has decided to hear Mr. Carp at 2:30 this afternoon in executive session, and that the appearance of Ben Davis has been postponed, subject to the call of the chairman.

Mr. Browder, will you take the stand, please?

TESTIMONY OF EARL RUSSELL BROWDER—Resumed

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, have you been able to obtain the copy of the new constitution of the Communist Party since yesterday?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I have not. Yesterday I told you that I would see that the book containing the record of the Convention of 1944 would be sent to you, and I was informed that that was mailed to the committee last night, addressed to the chairman of the committee. He should have it this morning.

Mr. ADAMSON. But we do not have it here. It will probably come later in the day.

I would like to show you some extracts from the Daily Worker of August 7, 1945, relating to the convention which you described here yesterday, and I would like you to look at this very carefully and tell me if that is a reasonably accurate copy of the new constitution as announced by the convention. [Handing a paper to the witness.]

Mr. BROWDER. I assume that it is an accurate copy.

Mr. ADAMSON. I would like to offer this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not read it, but I should like to have counsel read it so we will know what is in it. I would like to have that information before we proceed further with the witness.

Mr. THOMAS. You mean you want him to read that whole thing?

Mr. RANKIN. I don't know how long it is, how long it will take to read it.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will show it to you and you give me your estimate [handing the paper to Mr. Rankin].

Mr. RANKIN. You want to read it all?

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to read certain portions of it.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to get it in the record and I would also like to know what is in it. I have no objection to it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, in order to keep the record straight, this is a new constitution, or rather, the constitution of the re-constituted, united party which was adopted by the convention in New York in the latter part of July of this year? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. To the best of my knowledge and belief, it is.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yesterday you told us that you did not care to accept the responsibility of answering questions which dealt with policies of the party since the convention. I would like for you to read to the committee just this short paragraph, section 1 of article IV of the constitution. Read it aloud so that the reporter can get it.

Mr. BROWDER. May I ask what the purpose of that is?

Mr. ADAMSON. I just want to refresh your recollection.

Mr. BROWDER. You refer to article IV, Section 1?

Mr. ADAMSON. That is right.

Mr. BROWDER (reading): "Every member of the Party who is in good standing has not only the right but the responsibility to participate in the making of its policies and in the election of its leading committees in the manner provided for in this constitution."

Mr. ADAMSON. So that, as a member of the party, you continue under the same responsibility to participate in the making of the policies of the party, substantially as before? Isn't that true?

Mr. BROWDER. The same as all members of the party.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put the preamble to this constitution into the record here, although this is an exhibit. Shall we have it read in? I will show you how long it is. The preamble is six paragraphs.

Mr. RANKIN. Read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. RANKIN. Read it loud so the members of the committee can hear you, Mr. Adamson.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder is a good reader. How would you like to read it?

Mr. BROWDER. I haven't the slightest objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very good. Read the preamble.

Mr. BROWDER (reading): "The Communist Party of the United States is the political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism, Leninism. It champions the immediate and fundamental interest of the workers, farmers, and all who labor by hand and brain, against capitalist exploitation and oppression. As the advance guard of the working class it stands in the forefront of this struggle.

"The Communist Party upholds the achievements of American democracy and defends the United States constitution and its Bill of Rights against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and popular liberty. It uncompromisingly fights against imperialism and colonial oppression, against racial, national and religious discrimination, against Jimcrowism, anti-Semitism and all forms of chauvinism.

"The Communist Party struggles for the complete destruction of fascism and for a durable peace. It seeks to safeguard the welfare of the people and the Nation, recognizing that the working class through its trade unions and by its independent political action is the most consistent fighter for democracy, national freedom and social progress.

"The Communist Party holds as a basic principle that there is an identity of interest which serves as a common bond uniting the workers of all lands. It recognizes further that the true national interest of our country and the cause of peace and progress require the solidarity of all freedom-loving people and the continued and ever closer cooperation of the United Nations.

"The Communist Party recognizes that the final abolition of exploitation and oppression, of economic depressions and unemployment, of reaction and war, will be achieved only by the Socialist reorganization of society, by the common ownership and operation of the national economy under a government of the people led by the working class. The Communist Party therefore educates the working class in the course of its day-to-day struggles for its historical mission, the establishment of socialism. Socialism, the highest form of democracy, will guarantee the full realization of the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and will turn the achievements of labor, science and culture to the use and enjoyment of all men and women.

"In the struggle for democracy, peace and social progress, the Communist Party carries forward the democratic tradition of Jefferson, Paine, Lincoln, and Frederick Douglass, and the great working class tradition of Silvas, Debbs, and Ruhenberg. It fights side by side with all who join in this cause.

"For the advancement of the principles the Communist Party of the United States establishes the basic laws of the organization in the following constitution."

MR. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Browder, will you be good enough to read the much shorter preamble of the old constitution?

By the way, Mr. Chairman, we will have the book that Mr. Browder has ordered sent to us, which was marked yesterday for the record, so I won't offer this in evidence. We have a copy, however, of the old constitution from which Mr. Browder will read.

MR. RANKIN. Is there any difference?

MR. ADAMSON. We want to see.

MR. BROWDER. In the book which I have had sent to you I don't think this will be contained, so if you want it in evidence you should probably offer this copy.

MR. ADAMSON. Then I ask, after Mr. Browder finishes reading the preamble, I will offer this copy too.

MR. RANKIN. The reason I asked if there was any difference, I want to know what it is.

MR. ADAMSON. There is a difference.

MR. BROWDER. The preamble to the constitution of the Communist Party adopted by the Tenth National Convention, May 27-31, 1938, and amended by the special convention November 16-17, 1940.

"The Communist Party of the United States of America is a working class political party carrying forward today the traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson and Lincoln, and of the Declaration of Independence; it upholds the achievements of democracy, the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and defends the United States Constitution against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and all popular liberties; it is devoted to defense of the immediate interests of workers, farmers, and all toilers against capitalist exploitation, and to preparation of the working class for its historic mission to unite and lead the American people to extend these democratic principles to their necessary and logical conclusions.

"By establishing common ownership of the national economy, though a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; the abolition of all exploitation of man by man, nation by nation, and race by race, and thereby the abolition of class divisions in society; that is, by the establishment of socialism, according to the scientific principles enunciated by the greatest teachers of mankind, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, embodied in the Communist International; and the

free cooperation of the American people with those of other lands, striving toward a world without oppression and war, a world brotherhood of man.

"To this end, the Communist Party of the United States of America establishes the basic laws of its organization in this Constitution."

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, this booklet which I wish to offer for the record is entitled "The Constitution of the Communist Party of the United States of America," and has "5c" printed on the blue cover. It is published by the New York Workers Library Publishers. On the next page it says "Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc."

Mr. WOOD. As so identified, without objection, the committee will receive it in evidence.

(The document referred to, entitled "The Constitution of the Communist Party of the United States of America" was marked "Exhibit 4" and received in evidence.)

Mr. RANKIN. Let me ask one question right here. As I understood Mr. Browder's reading, both these constitutions are based on the principles enunciated by Karl Marx. Is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the old constitution of the Communist Party and the new constitution?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, sir. Would you like to see it?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I just heard him read it.

Mr. ADAMSON. This has been marked "No. 4."

Mr. RANKIN. Every member of the Party subscribes to that document?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAMSON. Going back for a moment to the association which you described yesterday, had it been the practice of the Communist Party prior to the organization of the association to prepare and publish a financial statement every year showing the method in which the funds of the party are handled?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe the publication of financial statements takes place immediately prior to conventions.

Mr. ADAMSON. Did the Communist Political Association prepare such a statement and publish it?

Mr. BROWDER. It did.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was that given to the newspapers?

Mr. BROWDER. It was.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you be good enough to have a copy sent to us, if it is not contained in the book?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAMSON. Did the Political Association send funds abroad during the approximate year of its existence?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. No funds whatever were sent abroad by the Association?

Mr. BROWDER. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. ADAMSON. Isn't it true that the association had a special fund for aiding the Communist parties and Communist movements in other countries?

Mr. BROWDER. The association contained in its budget provisions for welfare of anti-Fascist refugees and so on. During the last period—during the period of the activities of the association, expenditures for this purpose were confined to the United States, refugees in this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Adamson, let me ask a question there on the fundamentals. The philosophy that you enunciate in that preamble provides for the public ownership of all property, does it not?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; not of all property.

Mr. RANKIN. Of all land, homes, and means of production?

Mr. BROWDER. No; distinctly not.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, what about the land? It takes land? Let us take land first. Does it include the government ownership of all land?

Mr. BROWDER. Not necessarily.

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly what the doctrine of Marx and Lenin proposed.

Mr. BROWDER. Perhaps you know that doctrine better than I do. That is not my interpretation.

Mr. RANKIN. That is not your interpretation? Isn't that what happens when the Communists get control of a country? Don't they nationalize all the land, take it over, take over the homes, farms, make it all government property?

Mr. BROWDER. To the extent that it is necessary for the purpose of socializing the processes of production and bringing the greatest benefits of production to

the population as a whole, to that degree the Marxian program provides for the nationalizing of land.

Mr. RANKIN. Who is that decided by?

Mr. BROWDER. By the people.

Mr. RANKIN. By the people or by the commissars?

Mr. BROWDER. By the people.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you think that in the socialization of the land of Bulgaria the people of Bulgaria were consulted? Were the people who owned the land in those countries that have been forced into communism—were they consulted before their homes were taken away and their land taken away from them?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with the condition as you describe of socialization of land in Bulgaria. I have no such information, so I cannot comment upon it. In fact, I would question whether the information is accurate.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, probably that has been taken out of the constitution since you came to the Communist Party in the United States.

Let me ask you another thing. Do you not take all factories and means of production? Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not say that I would take over anything.

Mr. RANKIN. I mean isn't that what your party program provides; calls for?

Mr. BROWDER. The party program is directed toward eventual assumption of ownership of productive property basically, the main industries of the country and its financial institutions, by the people as a whole through the people's government.

Mr. RANKIN. Through the government in control.

In other words, that is what you mean there by nationalizing the economy of the country?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not specify nationalizing, and I don't think that that word was in the document that you read. I think that common ownership, nationalization, may or may not be a form of common ownership, and I think you are introducing an element of confusion when you interchange these terms.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me see that document be read, that first preamble. I want to find out just what it is. [Mr. Adamson handed a paper to Mr. Rankin.]

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman yield to me while you are looking at the document?

Mr. Browder, what do you mean by the "common ownership of property?"

Mr. BROWDER. What do I mean by the common ownership?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. How would you interpret that phrase "the common ownership of property?"

Mr. BROWDER. Common ownership of property is the distribution of the ownership among a number of people who hold the ownership in common, and when I speak of the common ownership of property by the people or by the nation, which are synonymous terms, we mean ownership which is held and exercised through the institutions set up by the whole of the people.

Mr. THOMAS. Wouldn't you believe, though, that the people who might read that preamble, who might see that phrase there, would naturally believe that all of the property in the United States owned now by the people would then be owned by the States?

Mr. BROWDER. That is, of course, a possible misinterpretation of intention.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you and the other Communists would interpret it one way, and the people would interpret it another way?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not say the people would. I would say that such people as yourself would certainly interpret it in a different way from what Communists would.

Mr. THOMAS. I rather believe you are right in that, and I rather believe that if it was put to a vote of the people in this room that they would interpret common ownership by the people of the property just as I have interpreted it.

Mr. BROWDER. That is possible.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me proceed, if I may.

This preamble of the constitution of the Communist Party that you read a moment ago, Mr. Browder, has this statement, and that is what I referred to:

"The Communist Party recognizes that the final abolition of exploitation and oppression, of economic crises and unemployment, of reaction and war, will be achieved only by the socialist reorganization of society—by the common ownership and operation of the national economy under a government of the people led by the working class."

Now, in the first place, the first instance there you say that it is to be owned by the socialist reorganization of society. What do you mean by that?

Mr. BROWDER. Just exactly what it says.

Mr. RANKIN. Then you state here "by the common ownership and operation of the national economy." Will you explain what that means? What do you mean by that? The national economy as I understand it takes in everything from the home of the humblest peasant to the castle of the wealthiest individual, from the land that the peasant plows to the factory that the manufacturer operates, and from the tree from which the lumberman makes his living, to the vast lumberyards, the vast operations that transform that lumber into finished products and distributes it throughout the world. Is that your understanding?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I would give the term "national economy" a somewhat narrower interpretation.

Mr. RANKIN. What would be your interpretation?

Mr. BROWDER. I would exclude from the interpretation that you give all property of a consumption nature in the hands of individual consumers. That would include homes and so on, and all personal property of a distinctly personal use.

Mr. RANKIN. You would not take over—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). I would include the natural resources of the country and its main productive apparatus which is represented in highly organized, modern industry and the large social aspects of the machinery of distribution.

Mr. RANKIN. That covers everything, as I understand, except the homes that people live in. You would take over the land that produces the crops?

Mr. BROWDER. I think a better definition would be to say that it covers all of those factors of the economy which has to be used collectively and not individually. I think that all of those factors which are of individual use and not of collective use would be excluded.

Mr. RANKIN. Will you cite some of those and give to us just what categories you refer to?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that my reply is very clear and definite.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I will make it more specific. Would you take over the land, the agricultural land of the country, have the government do so?

Mr. BROWDER. I would have to answer that question when the conditions of the problem as it develops in history have been stated. I could not give a categorical answer to such a question from the point of view of the general program.

Mr. RANKIN. But that is contemplated by this preamble to the Communist constitution, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Not necessarily.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, it is within the range of the provisions, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It could be if the conditions of the development of the problem would justify it. It would require a reference to concrete conditions. It could not be answered in the abstract.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, you know that in Russia Lenin and Trotsky did take over all land—the Government?

Mr. BROWDER. I cannot accept your historical description of the process in Russia.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, suppose you give us yours.

Mr. BROWDER. That would be far afield—lead us far afield.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, you know the Russian Government during that regime took over all the land in the name of the Russian Government, did it not?

Mr. BROWDER. The Russian Revolution nationalized the land.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, probably that is the term you prefer to use. Do you want to nationalize the land in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. I would want to qualify my answer by saying that if in the historical development of America we do have the same conditions which called for the nationalization of the land in Russia, then I would be in favor of it, but I am not at all sure that the development of America is going to approximate the historical development of Russia.

Mr. RANKIN. I don't think so either, when our boys get back from the war.

Mr. BROWDER. Therefore I very much dislike the machinical application of historical analogies from one country to another. I think each country has its very distinct historical development.

Mr. RANKIN. But that is within the range of the provisions of the preamble to the constitution of the Communist Party, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Abstractly it is a possible interpretation, but concretely it is not a necessary one.

Mr. RANKIN. And you find by referring to this that you are for the principles of Marx and Lenin. Now, under the policies of Marx and Lenin that was what happened in Russia, so it was evidently in contemplation by the framers of this constitution, and it must be in the contemplation of every member of the Communist Party who understands that constitution, must it not?

Mr. BROWDER. No, I would not say so, because your question, while not clearly stating it, implies that what you have in mind is that this constitution demands of those who adhere to it that they advocate and press for a mechanical repetition in America of the historical process which took place in Russia, and that is not the intention of the document.

Mr. RANKIN. You spoke of taking over the processes of production. That would mean all factories, would it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Eventually.

Mr. RANKIN. You would eventually take over all factories?

Mr. BROWDER. Eventually.

Mr. RANKIN. You would have them all operated by the Federal Government?

Mr. BROWDER. Eventually.

Mr. RANKIN. Then it would take all means of transportation and all highway construction and everything of that kind, and put that in the hands of the Central Government?

Mr. BROWDER. Eventually.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, your program here, laid down in this Communist, what you call "constitution" and which I call a "platform," is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not.

Mr. RANKIN. And it is in direct conflict with the constitution of every State in this Union?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not.

Mr. RANKIN. It is in direct conflict with the principles and provisions of the common law that governed this country, up to the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and that is in effect in many States now, if not abrogated by State law?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, you say that you support the principles of Marxism and Leninism. Marx was opposed to every kind of religion, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. RANKIN. He was opposed to an established church of any kind, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. He was opposed to any kind of an organized church?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. RANKIN. What kind of church was he opposed to?

Mr. BROWDER. He was opposed to a state church, very definitely.

Mr. RANKIN. He was an atheist, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know what you mean by "atheist."

Mr. RANKIN. Wasn't he an avowed atheist?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't think he ever subscribed himself as an atheist.

Mr. RANKIN. He renounced any belief whatever in Christianity, didn't he?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, Karl Marx was a Jew, I believe.

Mr. RANKIN. Was he I didn't know that. Probably I have read it some time. He was opposed to the system of religious worship that we have in this country, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know that Marx ever wrote about the system of religion institutions in America.

Mr. RANKIN. Lenin was opposed to all Christian churches, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. RANKIN. He closed them all, didn't he?

Mr. BROWDER. No, he did not.

Mr. RANKIN. What did he do with them?

Mr. BROWDER. Under the policies that were adopted by the Soviet Union under the leadership of Lenin, there was established for the first time in that great country complete religious freedom, the abolition of all oppression on religious grounds.

Mr. RANKIN. He closed all the churches, did he not?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; he did not.

Mr. RANKIN. Under the Lenin and Trotsky regime?

Mr. BROWDER. No, they did not.

Mr. RANKIN. Trotsky was with Lenin? He was second in command, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. No, he was not.

Mr. RANKIN. What was his position in the Government at the time of Lenin's death?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know offhand. It is a matter that could be referred to in historical books.

Mr. RANKIN. He expected to succeed Lenin as head of the Communist Party and therefore head of the Russian Government, did he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know what he expected.

Mr. RANKIN. And as a matter of fact, when Stalin ran him out of the country—or he ran out of the country to keep Stalin from catching him, didn't he?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that your version of history is very crude.

Mr. RANKIN. I am sure it is crude. It was a crude operation.

Mr. BROWDER. Exactly.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I don't object to anyone calling my knowledge of history crude, because this is a crude history we are dealing with.

Mr. BROWDER. I was not questioning your knowledge, Mr. Rankin; I was only questioning your expression at this moment.

Mr. RANKIN. I am trying to get information. I am getting right down to the crux of what this party is for. They not only took over the land under Lenin and Trotsky, but they proceeded to murder what they called the "Kulaks," that is, farmers who were reasonably prosperous, the landowners, or if they protested they either murdered them, killed them, executed them probably legally under the system, or exiled them to Siberia, did they not?

Mr. BROWDER. No, they did not.

Mr. RANKIN. They did not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. RANKIN. What condition did you find along that line when you went over there?

Mr. BROWDER. I found a condition of great improvement in the conditions of life, of education, of all phases of economic and social development of people, an improvement which grew progressively more rapid with the passing of every year. In fact, my observation of that system has confirmed me in my previous beliefs which had been gained by study, that socialism is incomparably the most efficient system of advancing human progress.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, you found a system of government that, from your point of view, was superior to the system of government in the United States, did you not?

Mr. BROWDER. I think I discovered something over there in practical life which America, in spite of its enormous advantages over Russia, could profitably learn something from.

Mr. RANKIN. Will you tell us what they were?

Mr. BROWDER. Exactly this: the application of the principle of collective ownership as against private ownership of the means of production.

Mr. RANKIN. Now then, you realize what happened, of course, under that collective ownership to the farmers of the Ukraine in 1931, I believe it was?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me go a step further, coming back to this communistic platform and the attitude of Lenin and Trotsky. You know, as a matter of fact, that Stalin was reared in a Christian home, do you not, and was educated for the priesthood in the Orthodox Russian Church? That is correct, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. I have read that, and I have no reason to doubt it.

Mr. RANKIN. And when he joined the Revolution it was because of his idea of the lack of justice under the existing regime, and when he came into power—one of the direct conflicts between him and Trotsky was the question of oppressing or persecuting the Christian people of Russia, was it not?

Mr. BROWDER. I cannot agree with your statement of the problems as they developed.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, Stalin has reopened the churches of Russia, that is, the Orthodox Churches, has he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not say that, no. I would say that under the policies which were developed by the Soviet Government under the leadership of Stalin there has been a progressive development of the exercise of religious freedom, which has been guaranteed at all time in the Russian Revolution.

Mr. THOMAS. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are devoting most of our time now to Russia. We are not investigating what happened in Russia or what

has happened in Bulgaria or whether Stalin was a Christian or not, or whatever he was. We are trying to find out certain things from this witness, and if we don't get down to brass tacks Mr. Adamson, our attorney, will never be able to finish.

Mr. RANKIN. I will state to the gentleman from New Jersey that what I was trying to find out was just what they mean by this preamble to the constitution of the Communist Party, but if the gentleman from New Jersey objects I will stop.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not objecting. I am just afraid that we will spend so much time—

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). I was showing just what kind of government—I was trying to show as best I could just what kind of government or lack of government, just what kind of order or lack of order, just what kind of confusion this Communist platform proposes for the American people. That is what I was trying to bring out. But I don't want to take up the time of the committee unnecessarily with it. I will turn it back to the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask two or three questions at this point.

If I understood your testimony a while ago correctly, Mr. Browder, the principle of the Communist Party as enunciated in this preamble involves in the Government's control the ultimate taking over by the people, through the constituted government that they set up, all production agencies of the country. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say the principal productive agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. And I believe you said a while ago that your interpretation of it was that it would not involve the taking over of property used for consumptive purposes purely, such as homes and subsistence farms? Is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. But that farms that were used for profit would come within the category of the properties stated which the Government would assume control of. Is that true?

Mr. BROWDER. No, I would say that on the question of farms this is a problem to be decided largely upon the basis of individual consent and the probable development towards the socialized forms through a system of voluntary cooperatives, not through state institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. That brings up the question that I was concerned about. From necessity there must be some authority to determine that question of what is to be taken over and what is not. Where would that authority rest, under the interpretation you place upon the document to which you subscribe?

Mr. BROWDER. I think all authority is ultimately derived from the people, and any authority which is not so derived and constantly refreshed is a false authority.

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously so. Isn't it true, Mr. Witness, that all of the people, each individual of government, cannot be consulted and their consent obtained with respect to taking over each individual piece of property? Would you of necessity have to have that authority placed in the hands of some individual or group of individuals, and if so, whom?

Mr. BROWDER. That is a purely hypothetical question, but I have no objection to answering it. I think it is quite certain that a government which was devoted to the welfare of the people would develop toward socialism and would establish certain tribunals in which these policies would be fixed and certain authoritative institutions for the proper application of these policies; that it would be done according to the best principles of representative government.

The CHAIRMAN. And naturally, those organizations would be implemented with power to enforce their decrees and decisions.

Mr. BROWDER. To the extent that is necessary, and my conception of a proper policy in that regard is that there would be the maximum application possible of the principle of consultation and agreement. These are principles which are very largely developed, even under our present form of economy.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask a question at this point? The witness is a writer of note and also a student of communism. We ought to have clear definitions if we are going to have clear thinking, should we not?

Mr. BROWDER. Correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask the witness if he will define the term "Communist"? Or let me put it this way: may I ask who as a "Communist"?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, it seems that the whole subject which concerns my appearance here is the attempt to define a Communist, and it is very difficult to concentrate the whole purpose of the discussion into a few sentences.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am a seeker after knowledge. I hear the expression used often, and I would like to have it defined.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, we all of us have heard in the last year public statements made by apparently responsible people that even the President of the United States was a Communist or a near Communist. I think that is stretching the term very far indeed, and I think that no useful purpose can be served by defining communism or a Communist in anything beyond the terms of the adherents of the Communist Party.

Mr. RANKIN. You never regarded the President of the United States as a Communist, did you?

Mr. BROWDER. I certainly did not. And I made that clear at all stages of public debate on this question.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you ever regard Mrs. Roosevelt as a Communist?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not. I have very sharp difference with you, Mr. Thomas, on that point.

Mr. THOMAS. I never said Mrs. Roosevelt was a Communist.

Mr. BROWDER. I understood you had.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no; you are mistaken.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask a little further then, would you draw a distinction between communism and socialism?

Mr. BROWDER. No, I would not, except in the terms that socialism used properly and in the scientific usage refers to a state of development of the economy which precedes communism, and the Communists propose to introduce socialism. That is their ultimate proposal.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, we have had a Communist Party in the United States and we have now, and we have had a Socialist Party in the United States. You would have to make a distinction between them, according to your earlier definition that a Communist is one who adheres to the Communist Party, is a member of it, and a Socialist is one who is a member of the Socialist Party. Would that be correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, if you want my opinion about the definition of a Socialist in relation to the Socialist Party, I would have to answer that to so define a Socialist you have to go far away from the Socialist Party. In some places that is even true of Democrats. [Laughter.]

Mr. RANKIN. According to your statement, then, socialism is merely a step towards communism?

Mr. BROWDER. A precondition for the later development of communism.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am not yet satisfied by a clear distinction between them.

Mr. LANDIS. One question there, Mr. Chairman. I notice here in the constitution and program of the Communist Party of America, adopted by the Joint Unity Convention of the Communist Party and the United States Communist Party of America the following:

"The Communist Party will keep in the foreground the idea of the necessity of violent revolution for the destruction of the capitalist state and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, based on Soviet power.

"The Communist Party will systematically and persistently propagate the idea of the inevitability of and necessity for violent revolution, and will prepare the workers for armed insurrection as the only means of overthrowing the capitalist state."

I just wondered if you thought the old Communist Party or the new Communist Association, if they believed in revolution to overthrow the capitalist state.

Mr. BROWDER. I can say very definitely "no" to both aspects of your question.

Mr. LANDIS. Wasn't there some difference on that point between you and this Frenchman Duclos? Wasn't there some difference in your program of returning to the class struggle and class warfare?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. LANDIS. No difference?

Mr. RANKIN. What was the difference between you and Mr. Duclos? I understood it was his statement that brought about the change from the Communist Association, or whatever you call it, back to the Communist Party. What was the difference between them?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not care to discuss that matter in this forum. My opinions have been made public and are a matter of record. I have no desire to elaborate upon them in any way.

Mr. RANKIN. You didn't agree with Mr. Duclos, as I understand it.

Mr. BROWDER. I do not care to discuss the question.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you embrace the philosophy that he expressed?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not care to discuss this question.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the question is pertinent, if he knows what the man expressed. He ought to know.

Mr. THOMAS. Whether the witness doesn't care to discuss it, that is just his desire; whether we want him to discuss it is another question.

The CHAIRMAN. If the question relates to what someone else thinks, he can assert his right; if he knows what the party named said, it is a question of whether he agrees with that. That is the question before us.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I ask for an answer to my question, if he agrees with this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is pertinent, if he knows what the statement was.

Mr. RANKIN. You read the statement, did you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Which statement?

Mr. RANKIN. The statement of Mr. Duclos.

Mr. LANDIS. I just asked him if he agreed to the statement.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I am asking, if he agrees with the statement of Jacques Duclos to the Communists of America.

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know what particular statement you have reference to.

Mr. THOMAS. I will tell him what the statement is. You remember the statement that Mr. Duclos made to the Communists here, which resulted in your resignation as president?

Mr. BROWDER. No, I do not. I never resigned from anything.

Mr. THOMAS. You didn't resign?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Maybe they put you out. Anyway it resulted in your abdication.

Mr. BROWDER. You are expressing an opinion to which you are entitled, and in which I do not necessarily have to share.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you ever heard of the Mr. Duclos that we are talking about?

Mr. BROWDER. What Duclos do you have reference to?

Mr. THOMAS. I am referring to the Communist in France who made a statement to the Communists in America, and as a result of that statement you either resigned or you were put out.

Mr. BROWDER. I never heard of any Communist in France making a statement to the Communists of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, he might have made a statement to the Communists of the world then, but you certainly know who we are talking about. Stop this foolishness.

Mr. LANDIS. It was a statement with regard to the dissolution of the Communist Party in the United States. That was the statement.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Browder knows all about it. He knows so much more about it than we do that it is absurd.

Mr. BROWDER. I even know, Mr. Thomas, something about the law, and when you use technicalities against me I am perfectly entitled in law and morals to take refuge in technicalities myself.

Mr. THOMAS. And you think these are technicalities that we are asking you?

Mr. BROWDER. I have said that I do not care to discuss the questions that you raise, and if you want to force me to discuss them you will have to do so according to the technicalities of the law.

Mr. THOMAS. All right then. I am in favor of having Mr. Browder answer these questions, even if we have to force him with the technicalities of the law, but he is just evading the questions. He knows that one of the main reasons he is in this room is because we want to find out something about the connection between this Mr. Duclos and the Communists abroad, and the Communists here in the United States, and he is going to evade and avoid answering every question that has anything to do with that subject, or he will be in the same position that Trotsky was.

Mr. LANDIS. May I ask a question, if this is a fair question: Would the leader of the Communist Party, say Mr. Duclos, in France—would he have to have permission of the International to criticize the Communists in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Landis, the international organization was dissolved in June 1943, and there has been no international organization since that time.

Mr. LANDIS. Prior to that time?

Mr. BROWDER. Prior to that time? No, not necessarily.

Mr. LANDIS. I just wondered if Mr. Duclos was speaking on his own or was speaking from the International?

Mr. BROWDER. I can not answer your question about any particular incident, but I can answer in general that to my knowledge of the international Communist movement, there has always been a great deal of freedom of speech and press.

Mr. THOMAS. Then they want to free us?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I think the question with reference to this Duclos incident, which resulted in Mr. Browder's removal and the reorganization of the Communist Party, should be answered by the witness. The chairman of the committee is an able lawyer.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been established yet that Mr. Browder was removed. Mr. RANKIN. He knows the statement that was made by Mr. Duclos, and he tells the committee that he is going to take advantage of every technicality. I want to get the reason for Mr. Browder's removal.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it might be better to indicate to this committee if you agree with the separation of yourself from the particular position you occupied.

Mr. BROWDER. The convention of the Communist Political Association was held, which changed its constitution to rename it the Communist Party of the United States, and as is customary at conventions, the officers were elected and the delegates to the convention saw fit to elect officers, which did not include myself. As to their reasons for that action, you will have to inquire of them. I cannot answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Of your knowledge, Mr. Browder, was there any reason offered in connection with any statements that have been made by the party named, Duclos, as having influenced the action of any of the delegates in not renaming you? Were such statements made in your presence?

Mr. BROWDER. Not directly, but these are questions such as are usual in the development of political organizations, which can be answered only as opinions.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not be an opinion if you heard it. That is what I am asking you, if you heard any statements made by any delegate in that convention, offering as a reason for opposing your reelection to an official position therein, the statements credited to Mr. Duclos?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not hear any such statement, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions by the committee?

Mr. RANKIN. I could ask some other questions but he will not answer them. Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, I show you a photostatic copy of extracts from the Daily Worker of New York, dated May 24, 1945, on the subject of the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States, and also another article entitled "A Foreword to the Article of Jacques Duclos," and the distinguished author of this article is Earl Browder. I wonder if you could identify that and tell us if you know the author. [Handing a paper to the witness.]

Mr. BROWDER. I am familiar with the document which you hand me, and the foreword written by Earl Browder is an article written by myself.

Mr. ADAMSON. And this article, Mr. Chairman, consists of three pages. They are photostatic copies, which I should like to offer for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. With that identification, without objection they will be received.

(The photostat of extracts from the Daily Worker, New York, Thursday, May 24, 1945, was marked "Exhibit 5" and received in evidence.)

Mr. RANKIN. Of course I will not object, but what is it you are putting into the record?

Mr. ADAMSON. This is an extract from an article published in the Daily Worker, dated May 24, 1945, which deals at great length with the dissolution of the Communist Party. It is a statement by the Frenchman, Jacques Duclos, and on the same page there is the beginning of an article written by Mr. Browder himself, in which he criticizes or answers the article written by the Frenchman. The two articles are on the same page.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, you mean Earl Browder, the witness here?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. On the same page, answering the same document that defines the attitude of Jacques Duclos?

Mr. ADAMSON. I would not want to characterize it as an answer, but there are two articles and they are on the same subject matter.

Mr. RANKIN. On the same page of the same paper?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. I have no objection to it going into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. It has been received.

Mr. THOMAS. Who is Mr. Duclos?

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Duclos, author of the article which has just been handed me, is the leader of the Communist Party in France.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you agree with him, with his statement?

Mr. BROWDER. I would refer you to the fact that my opinions have been a matter of public record, and I have nothing to add to the record.

Mr. RANKIN. I don't care anything about them being a matter of public record; I am asking you now if you agree with that statement by Duclos?

Mr. BROWDER. That is impossible to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Why is it impossible, Mr. Witness? You are familiar with the article, aren't you?

Mr. BROWDER. I am familiar with the article.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you agree with every observation made in it?

Mr. BROWDER. With every observation made in it? I don't think that in all my life I ever read an article in which I agreed with all the observations, except my own articles, of course. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. I was not asking you about your past experiences; I want to know if you agree with the statement of principles embodied in that article.

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know what statement of principle you mean.

The CHAIRMAN. Any of them.

Mr. BROWDER. It is subject to many interpretations, and a "yes" or "no" answer will not clarify but will only create further confusion.

Mr. ADAMSON. You mean by that, Mr. Browder, that you doubt the ability of the members of the committee to understand your explanation?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I do not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, why do you assume that it will create such a confusion in their minds?

Mr. BROWDER. Because the question is not defined whatever, and a "yes" or "no" answer to such a question, no matter what the question refers to, always creates more confusion than clarity.

Mr. ADAMSON. Suppose you answer it to the best of your ability. It is not necessary that you give categorical answers here. You are the witness, of course. Suppose you make an effort.

Mr. BROWDER. I really am unable to summon the tremendous energy required for such an effort as that at this time.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Browder, in your testimony and the document which we have reviewed here this morning—

Mr. MURDOCK (interposing). May I ask a question before counsel proceeds? What was the purpose in submitting this paper as an exhibit with these two articles side by side? Is one of them a comment on the other?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yet the witness does not answer the question categorically, then we are expected, I presume, to get the answer by reading the two articles.

Mr. ADAMSON. I should like for him to say what he means, Mr. Murdock. As a matter of fact, I have somewhat a feeling of resentment that he thinks the members of the committee would not understand his explanation, and it would wind up in greater confusion in your minds.

Mr. BROWDER. Perhaps that would be my thought and not that of the committee. I am not imputing any lack of ability on the part of the committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. I suggest that you make an effort, then, to answer the question.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, the reason I brought that up was because he says that the new Communist Association was against revolution and the overthrow of capitalism by force. That is what I understand from his answer.

Mr. BROWDER. I did not say that the Communist Association was against revolution. If I would come out against revolution I would be repudiating the origin of my Nation, and I am not going to do that. I am a proponent of revolution.

Mr. LANDIS. You are a proponent of revolution?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; and I think that America has advanced only through revolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Probably that accounts for your not protesting more vigorously against the revolution in the Communist Party that Mr. Duclos proposed in his statement.

Mr. BROWDER. Was there a revolution?

Mr. LANDIS. It seems to me there was.

Mr. BROWDER. You can inform me about such things.

Mr. LANDIS. I understand Mr. Duclos was for a return to the class struggle and class warfare, and I understood the article there by you to be against that. That is the point I wanted to make. Are you for the association to return to the class struggle and the class warfare?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't think that defines any of the issues involved in the political debate.

Mr. LANDIS. I think that is a big issue against the Communist Association in the United States.

Mr. BROWDER. That is your understanding. You are entitled to it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, isn't it true that the reconstituted Communist Party is still bound by the principles announced by Marx and Lenin and Stalin? You referred to Marxism and Leninism and Stalinism, I believe.

Mr. BROWDER. I believe that those principles are common to all organizations of Communists, regardless of what name is involved.

Mr. ADAMSON. You have appeared before congressional committees on similar subjects before, have you not, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Not only congressional committees but other institutions of the Government. My latest appearance was last March or April before a subcommittee appointed by the War Manpower Commission in Chicago to investigate charges that had been brought against Government employees supposed to be members of the Communist Political Association, and I appeared before that commission and testified as to the nature of the Communist Political Association, and as a result the proceedings against that employee of the Government were dropped.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you have made quite a number of speeches and written quite a number of articles on these subjects, have you not?

Mr. BROWDER. I have. My views are well known.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you also know that Mr. William Z. Foster and a number of other persons have made speeches and written numerous articles?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAMSON. In other words, you are not the only active individual in this field?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you also know that the doctrines publicly announced by you and your associates concerning Stalinism and Leninism advocate and preach the total destruction of what they describe as the "capitalist machinery" of government. Isn't that in substance the language?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not remember that particular language.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, in substance, that is correct, is it not? Let us not get mixed upon in technicalities which you mentioned awhile ago. Let us cut it short.

Mr. BROWDER. No; I could not agree just in that short form in which you put it, because I know from experience that that kind of short formulations are the starting point for the most complete distortion and falsification of the position which the Communist actually holds.

Mr. ADAMSON. Suppose you give us the long form answer.

Mr. BROWDER. I would require notice from the committee to answer such a question as that, that I could prepare myself for reference to my writings, which are on record, which I would be very glad to place before the committee in part or in full. In the last 10 years I have published in book and pamphlet form some 2,000 pages, covering almost every political question under the sun.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe you gave us that information yesterday.

Mr. BROWDER. And I will be glad to place all of that before the committee, or any part of it it wishes. I do not care to elaborate extemporaneously on these questions.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let us take a specific example of some of the objectives of the Communist Party, as reconstituted here. I have noticed numerous newspaper articles—for example, that a meeting has been called in New York of certain representatives from the Southern States for the purpose of discussing the organization or formation of what they call a "Negro Soviet Republic," and that meeting apparently is under the auspices of the leaders or members of the Communist Party. I believe the subject was discussed at the last convention.

Mr. BROWDER. I believe you are misinformed.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, suppose you straighten us out, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I can only straighten you out by telling you that your information is false.

Mr. ADAMS. And the newspaper articles, then, are in error? Concerning your convention last summer?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that I was present in most of the convention meetings and never heard it discussed, and my opinion is that anyone who makes such a statement is deliberately lying.

Mr. ADAMSON. And the newspaper articles, then, are in error? Is that your view?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not say "error." I would say "falsehood." I don't think it was an unintentional mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. What paper carried that article? Do you know, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. No: I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever seen the article?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not remember having seen it.

Mr. ADAMSON (handing a newspaper clipping to the witness). That is dated the 24th of this month, and I believe it is a clipping from the Journal American.

Mr. BROWDER. My experience would teach me to judge, even without special investigation, that any article in that paper would be false.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, can you tell us, Mr. Browder, when you first heard that subject discussed? I believe you became an officer, you say, a general officer, way back in 1930. Did you hear that subject discussed as far back as 1930 by anyone?

Mr. BROWDER. I have heard the theory that has been referred to as a Soviet Republic in the South specifically discussed in order to refute it.

Mr. ADAMSON. And how recently have you heard discussion by your associates on that subject?

Mr. BROWDER. Not in the last 10 years.

Mr. ADAMSON. Have you seen any of the newspaper publicity on the subject recently?

Mr. BROWDER. I have.

Mr. ADAMSON. And your statement here, then, is that is false and misleading?

Mr. BROWDER. False and misleading, and deliberately so, and not for the purpose of conducting an examination into the question itself but for ulterior purposes connected with current political struggles dealing with entirely other matters, to affect elections, specifically the election of Ben Davis to the council in the coming elections in New York City.

Mr. ADAMSON. I am glad to have your opinion and characterization on this matter.

Mr. BROWDER. That is not my opinion; that is just a statement of fact.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well. And you brand any articles in the Daily Worker on that subject as equally false and misleading?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well then——

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). I refer to these specific articles which you brought forward, which did not include any articles from the Daily Worker nor any of the responsible press of New York.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will you concede, then, that any articles in the Daily Worker would be regarded by you as responsible and trustworthy on this subject about which we are talking now?

Mr. BROWDER. I would consider that an article on this subject in the Daily Worker would, in all probability, be responsible and reliable.

Mr. ADAMSON. And if the Daily Worker published such articles, then, would you now say that there might be some foundation for the news report?

Mr. BROWDER. I would ask you if you have any such article in mind to present it.

Mr. ADAMSON. No; I am——

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). So I can examine it concretely, and not have hypothetical questions asked.

Mr. ADAMSON. But if they published them, you would give some credence to it, would you?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not understand the value of questions of a hypothetical nature nor hypothetical answers.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, Mr. Browder, let me ask you one more question before we adjourn. Isn't it true that one of the principal points of dispute between you and the Duclos faction was some expressed, or let us say feared, desire on your part to make the headquarters of the Communist International here in the United States instead of in Moscow?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that any such views are so completely fantastic and so completely unrelated to any realities in the world of today that they could only

arise in the mind of someone who was suffering from delusions or some other form of insanity.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, then, your answer to that question is "no"? [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, I want him to say "no," Mr. Chairman. He has not said it yet.

Mr. BROWDER. Such a question as that requires something more glorified than a simple "no."

The CHAIRMAN. For the purposes of our understanding that was what you intended to convey, the impression you meant to convey to us?

Mr. BROWDER. I would like to elaborate the "no" on such a question as that.

Mr. RANKIN. In one of your speeches—Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the House with more questions along this line at this time, but I want to ask him—we will have to adjourn before noon, because some Members want to be on the floor when the House convenes, for certain reasons, and I am one of them, but I would like to know when we can take up Mr. Browder again?

The CHAIRMAN. At 10 o'clock tomorrow morning?

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, if this interrogation is going to be continued interminably from day to day, I must enter a very emphatic protest. I have already been here 2 days.

The CHAIRMAN. We will excuse you at noon tomorrow.

Mr. BROWDER. Holding me over until tomorrow places me in a very great difficulty. I had assumed that you would have disposed of me at least within 2 days, and I had postponed very important business appointments until tomorrow morning, and now it means that I will have to make these arrangements all over again, and I am an unemployed man who is looking for work, and you are doing me great damage when you disarrange my appointments.

The CHAIRMAN. I was not aware of that, Mr. Browder, because you stated yesterday that you were unemployed, and we assumed that we were not inconveniencing you.

Mr. BROWDER. But it is the unemployed man who has to be the most careful to keep his appointments.

The CHAIRMAN. I want you to understand that we want to accommodate you.

Mr. RANKIN. It would shorten the examination greatly if he would answer the questions that are propounded to him by the committee and counsel.

Mr. BROWDER. May I say in reply to that if you had not tried to repeat the substance of the hearings of a similar committee 6 years ago, which has taken up 95 percent of your time, you could have disposed of me in an hour.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I think if Mr. Browder will answer this question very frankly, we may not need him any more.

Mr. RANKIN. Let us take up at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. ROBINSON. We can go on here for 10 or 15 minutes now.

Mr. THOMAS. We cannot finish in 10 minutes.

Mr. LANDIS. Why not make it 1 o'clock this afternoon or 1:30? I suggest we excuse Mr. Browder until 1:30.

Mr. BROWDER. Very good.

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess until 1:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 11:55 o'clock a. m., a recess was taken until 1:30 o'clock p. m. this day.)

AFTER RECESS

The committee reassembled at 1:30 o'clock p. m., pursuant to recess.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Mr. Browder, will you resume the stand?

TESTIMONY OF EARL RUSSELL BROWDER—Resumed

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, you told us this morning that you regarded the articles printed in the Journal American in New York as being erroneous and misleading. I believe you said you thought they were all lies. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to show you an article dated July 24, 1945, from the New York Times, touching on the same subject matter, and ask you if you class that article in the same category with the Journal American article? [Handing a paper to the witness.]

Mr. BROWDER. I regard the editorial introduction of that article as being inspired by the same source. It is developed beyond that prejudicial introduction, developed more in accordance with responsible newspaper ethics, but inspired by the Journal American article.

Mr. ADAMSON. In other words, you believe the New York Times item was influenced by the Journal American publicity?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And let me show you an article on the same subject published in the World Telegram dated July 23, 1945, and ask you the same question. [Handing a paper to the witness.]

Mr. BROWDER. That is clearly inspired from the same source as the Journal American story, and equally erroneous.

Mr. ADAMSON. You regard the statement then as false?

Mr. BROWDER. Essentially false.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you now refer to all three articles—that is, the New York Times, the New York World Telegram and the Journal American? Is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. As misrepresenting facts.

Mr. RANKIN. What do those articles say? What is in them?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will show them to you and then I will identify them for the record.

Mr. RANKIN. I want them put in the record.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes; I am going to do that. I want the committee to see them.

I want to identify these two newspaper articles. One is from the New York Times of July 24, 1945, and the headline reads "Negro Soviet Plan Revived by Davis." I wish to offer that for the record, Mr. Chairman. Do you want it read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it will be received.

(The clipping from the New York Times of July 24, 1945, entitled "Negro Soviet Plan Revived by Davis" marked "Exhibit 6" and received in evidence.)

Mr. ADAMSON. The second one is an article from the New York World Telegram dated July 23, 1945. The headline reads: "Davis Revives Red Negro Nation Plan." I offer that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is received.

(The clipping from the New York World Telegram dated July 23, 1945, entitled "Davis Revives Red Negro Nation Plan" was marked "Exhibit 7" and received in evidence.)

Now, Mr. Browder, I wish to refresh your recollection from the World Telegram article. I will read this paragraph to you, and I want you to tell me whether or not that is correct:

"In his article reviving the Black Belt issue, the Manhattan councilman joined his co-leaders in the Communist movement in their current orgy of literary breast-beating (called 'Bolshevik self-criticism'), intended to expiate their past endorsement of Earl Browder's policy of cooperating with the American system of free enterprise.

"This is part of a campaign to discredit Browder so completely that the Communists, at their national convention here Thursday, will unanimously scrap him as president and revive the Communist Party with all its ultrarevolutionary trimmings."

Could you tell us now, since your memory has been refreshed, why the convention failed to reelect you to office?

Mr. BROWDER. I wonder if the gentleman would consider that that would be a proper question directed to a former leader of any other political party that has not been reelected at a convention? I think that has happened with many political parties, and I wonder why such a question is introduced here. Is it the function of this committee to inquire into the inner life of political parties and why they elect or fail to elect particular people?

Mr. ADAMSON. I think, Mr. Browder, that the Chairman probably could answer your question better than I.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say a word here? Mr. Browder, of course, explains that the Communist Party is only a political party. I think that the testimony over a period of years before other committees, and I think Mr. Browder has been able to prove in the past before other committees, that the Communist Party is more than a political party. The Communist Party only uses the term "political party" in order to mask its real activities. I just want to make that observation before you rule.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the question that has been asked is a little vague and probably calls for a conclusion. As I understand it you are asking the witness the reasons why this particular organization did not elect him president, as they had in the past. I don't see how he could possibly know why they didn't do it. If the witness knows, of course, I think he should answer, if he knows why they did not reelect him as president.

Mr. THOMAS. I guess the witness knows pretty well.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you know, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. First of all, I would like it established as to whether it is recognized procedure here to inquire into methods of electing leadership of political parties, and the reasons therefor.

The CHAIRMAN. I think, in the light of the evidence that has been developed, the question now becomes pertinent, if you know.

Mr. BROWDER. Whether it is pertinent or not, Mr. Chairman, I think I am entitled to know whether this committee has established as a precedent that the committee is empowered to investigate elections of leadership of political parties, the reasons therefor.

The CHAIRMAN. The answer to that is that the committee is empowered to investigate any activities of any organization or any individual. The committee conceives it to be within its scope to investigate the activities of any organization that expounds American principles of government.

Mr. BROWDER. If the Chair rules that a similar question would be equally proper if directed to the former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, then I will consider that that is sufficient grounds for me to proceed to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. If the former chairman of the Democratic National Committee is called as a witness here and the question is propounded to him, I would rule that it is a pertinent question for further inquiry by the committee.

Mr. BROWDER. I hope the leadership of the Democratic and the Republican parties will take note of the precedent that is thus being established, and then I will answer the question that I do not know. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMSON. That is a very momentous answer.

Mr. Browder, let me show you another extract from the Scripps-Howard staff writer Frederick Waltman, in the New York World Telegram of July 27. The headline of the article reads "Stalin Runs Reds in United States, Browder Says." Will you take a look at that article and tell me whether or not that refreshes your recollection to any extent? [Handing the paper to the witness.]

Mr. BROWDER. I remember reading the article when it appeared. What is your question about it?

Mr. ADAMSON. What foundation is there to the article, so far as your own statements are concerned?

Mr. BROWDER. I consider that the article is a fantastic fabrication.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then is it your testimony that the Communist Party in the United States has no connection whatever, either directly or indirectly, with any organization outside of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do we understand that the statements that are attributed to you in that article are false?

Mr. BROWDER. I didn't notice particular statements attributed to me. I only took note of the general purport of the article, which is summed up in the headline "Stalin Runs Reds in the United States, Browder says," and I brand that whole conception embodied in that headline as a complete fabrication.

Mr. THOMAS. Who wrote this article?

Mr. ADAMSON. Frederick Waltman.

Mr. THOMAS. In what paper?

Mr. ADAMSON. The World Telegram of New York. Now, Mr. Browder, you stated yesterday, I believe—and today too—that the international Communist organization had been completely dissolved. I want to ask you a question which I want you to understand perfectly. If you don't understand it, say so. At the convention in New York in the latter part of July of this year did you say in words or in substance to the convention, when you found that you were not going to be reelected, that you intended to defend yourself before the international board concerning your policies and acts?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you made no statement of that character?

Mr. BROWDER. I made a statement to the convention that the discussion which had taken place concerned not only American questions but questions of interna-

tional significance and purport; that no opinions on international questions could be considered final in the scientific sense until they had been reviewed by the best thought of all countries affected thereby; that as to any international discussion that might take place through the press or otherwise, if I had any opportunity to participate in such international discussions I would defend the thesis that I had previously expressed in the judgment of these international problems. There was at no time or place any suggestion of the existence of an international organization or any suggestion of the advisability of reestablishing an international organization, and any such proposal I would consider fantastic.

MR. ADAMSON. But you did consider that any action taken by the Convention would be subject to criticism and review by people and organizations who belonged to Communist organizations, let us say, outside of the United States?

MR. BROWDER. No more so than the same would be true of any other body in this country. I was dealing with the questions in the category of scientific problems. Insofar as they were questions of decision in the United States, the decisions made by bodies in the United States are final and not subject to review by anyone. Scientific problems, however, are of an entirely different nature. There are no tribunals which can pass final judgment, and such questions are subject to international discussion, the same as the problems of any other scientific field, and are settled by a consensus of scientific opinion.

MR. ADAMSON. You still go back, though, Mr. Browder, to the fact that you recognize opinions and influences outside of the United States with regard to these policies of the Communist Party in this country? Isn't that true?

MR. BROWDER. This characteristic I think I share with most Americans today, who certainly take into account international opinions on all international questions since we have decided to join the United Nations.

MR. ADAMSON. On the question of the United Nations, let me read you an excerpt from the pen of one of your associates.

MR. THOMAS. Mr. Adamson, have you finished with this article?

MR. ADAMSON. Yes.

MR. THOMAS. May I ask a question there?

MR. ADAMSON. For the moment, let me finish this question first—

"The greatest and most powerful and most dependable champion of freedom and equality for all people in the coalition known as the United Nations is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

I suppose you are familiar with this little pamphlet, are you not, Mr. Browder, written by Mr. Ben Davis, Jr? [Handing a pamphlet to the witness.]

MR. BROWDER. I don't think I have that pamphlet, but I am familiar with the thought that you quoted, and I myself hold that thought.

MR. ADAMSON. So we are agreed, then, that you and your associates regard the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as the greatest, the most powerful, and most dependable champion of freedom of all the United Nations?

MR. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

MR. THOMAS. Right at that point, Mr. Adamson, I would like to ask a question of Mr. Browder.

Mr. Browder, I am reading from this article which you have already said is absolutely false. I just want to ask you a question because it quotes you in one place and quotes Mr. Foster. I will just read these two paragraphs:

"The 3-day convention opened yesterday. On the day before, Foster himself confirmed Browder's accusations. He cited Marshal Stalin as the authority to prove that Browder was guilty of such incredible nonsense as 'championing capitalism,' and ignoring class war, and stating that progressive capitalism has held to the verge a tragic postwar crisis in America, therefore Communists should cooperate in one way by continuing their no strike policy. Foster replied contemptuously, 'it might be stated that Stalin is one of those who think that economic crisis after this war is inevitable in the United States. Stalin, not Browder, is right in his forecast of America's postwar economic crisis.'"

Now, will you please tell the committee whether, first, those are correct quotations?

MR. BROWDER. I think that the whole paragraph which you read is such a complete caricature of what it purports to describe as to be completely misleading and unworthy of the attention of a serious congressional committee.

MR. THOMAS. Well, I think I rather understand what you mean, but I believe that you mean that because this writer did not elaborate on your quotation he made a misquotation himself. Is that what you mean?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say much more than that. I would say that he has brought together such a mixture of fact, half fact, and falsehood, that it is impossible on the basis of any such article to direct any intelligent question.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I am not so certain about that, but on the quotation, your quotation and Mr. Foster's quotation, are they correct in their wording?

Mr. BROWDER. Any quotations of that kind used in such a context as that are falsehoods, whether the particular words are actual quotations or not, because they are placed in a context which renders them false.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I see, but you admit, though, that the wording is correct?

Mr. BROWDER. I have not checked on them. I don't raise that issue.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you deny that the wording is correct?

Mr. BROWDER. I say that it is sufficient to answer that the context in which they are placed completely discredits them and brands them as false.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not thinking of the context. I am just thinking of the wording. This is very simple, perhaps too simple to even bring up. At the same time I just want to have for the record whether or not you believe your quotation is correct. First, we will take yours.

Mr. BROWDER. I would say "no." I would say that it completely misrepresents me.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you ever make that statement?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that that article misrepresents what I said.

Mr. THOMAS. But I want to know whether you made the statement. Never mind whether it misrepresents what you said. Did you make the statement?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. All right. Now, to the best of your knowledge do you know whether the quotation from Mr. Foster is correct?

Mr. BROWDER. I can not speak for anyone else.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all right then.

Mr. ADAMSON. You know Mr. Foster, do you, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you regard him as—well, let us say an authentic source for a statement of policy of the Communist Party not only of this country but all over the world?

Mr. BROWDER. Are you trying by your question to begin to develop before this committee differences of opinion between Mr. Foster and myself? If so, I want to object to any such line of questioning. It is not the business of this committee to enter into the debates that take place within a political party.

Mr. ADAMSON. To satisfy your curiosity, Mr. Browder, I merely want to establish your acquaintance with Mr. Foster, because I want to read you just a short statement given by Mr. Foster before the old Dies committee under oath and ask you about it. Are we agreed that you are acquainted with Mr. Foster and his official position with the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster says, talking about the objectives of the people who adhere to the Communist Party line and their attitude towards these governments, talking about the various governments of the world—the establishment of these governments and the establishment of Soviet governments—you said yesterday that the present party is the same party, and that they still adhere to the principles of Marxism, Leninism, and Stalinism. Would you say that Mr. Foster's statement here concerning their objectives and efforts of the Communist adherence over the world is a fair statement today?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not accept such a quotation as a fair statement of Communist policy at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. Not at any time, did you say?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you would say that Mr. Foster's statement was erroneous, then and now, both?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not attempt to make him responsible for your quotation from his material.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you like to read it yourself?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I would not.

Mr. ADAMSON. I am reading a quotation, Mr. Chairman, from volume 9, page 5390, of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand, Mr. Adamson, that the witness denies the correctness of the statements in the quotation.

Mr. ADAMSON. I merely want to identify the location of the quotation.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand the witness to say that the quotation did not represent his conception of the aims of the party.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you conceive that the Communist Party must not enter into any civil arrangement with capitalistic governments? Is it your objective, as you see it, to cooperate with capitalistic governments in the governing of not only the United States but the respective countries in which your party exists?

Mr. BROWDER. I think you will have to phrase your question in such a way that you will not imply that I am a spokesman for any group of Communists; otherwise it is impossible for me to answer that. I am a private individual and not authorized to speak for anyone.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well. I will qualify my question to the United States and to you as an individual member of the party.

Mr. BROWDER. I would suggest, if I might be so bold, that if you would phrase your question to refer to that period in which I was the spokesman for the United States of the Communists in the United States, it would be possible for me to answer you.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand that you have had a change of views on that subject since you retired from office?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Then what would be the purpose of relating it to the time you were the spokesman of the party? You are now being asked for your views as an individual member.

Mr. BROWDER. Because I would like to establish, just as a matter of principle which might become important, that I am not appearing before this committee as the spokesman for anyone.

The CHAIRMAN. And you don't care to give your individual views as a member?

Mr. BROWDER. I consider it irrelevant to the purposes of this committee what the views of a particular individual might be, unless he was called for a particular witness as an expert or something.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. Then suppose we change the form of this question and ask you if that was your view at the time you were head of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. State the question again with that background.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you—or did you—advocate, and was it your purpose to cooperate with the capitalistic government in the United States, as you characterized it, in the government of the country?

Mr. BROWDER. It was the purpose of the Communist Political Association when I was its spokesman to cooperate with the government of this country in every possible way for the purpose of prosecuting the war to victory, for the establishment of a durable peace, and for the securing of the utmost measure of economic well-being for the country after the war.

The CHAIRMAN. Would that have been true even though you did not subscribe to the principles of the government with which you were thus cooperating?

Mr. BROWDER. That would be true regardless of any detailed differences of opinion with those who head the government, or the parties which were in power in the government, so long as the circumstances which obtained in the world remained as we judged them.

Mr. ADAMSON. Following up the chairman's thought there, in view of the changes that have transpired since the Political Association was abolished, would you, or do you, continue in your view that such cooperation is wise and necessary?

Mr. BROWDER. I declared at the convention in July that in my opinion the convention had not fundamentally changed its policy.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you embrace that view today?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Are you familiar with a little book which appears to be a catechism or book of instructions—it is entitled "Hand Book on the Soviet Trades Unions for Workers Delegations." It is published by the Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the U. S. S. R., Moscow, 1937, edited by A. Losofski.

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with that book.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Browder, isn't it now—and back for many years in the past—one of the objectives of the Communist Party to infiltrate its members into the various trade unions in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. And do you think that your literature on that subject is erroneous, then?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with any literature on that subject.

Mr. ADAMSON. Is it your testimony that there is no effort now on the part of the Communist Party to infiltrate its members into the trade unions of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Let us make it quite clear that we understand one another. When you use the word "infiltrate" you create the presumption of people going into places where they have no business, for ulterior purposes, and understanding your word in that sense I will say categorically that it has never been the policy of the Communists to infiltrate any organization, labor union or otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. And you know of no such movement existing today?

Mr. BROWDER. I certainly do not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, whether you call it "infiltrate" or not, isn't it a fact that the members of the Communist Party are encouraged to join trade unions, and likewise members of the trade unions are encouraged to join the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Of course.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you say that is not in anywise infiltration?

Mr. BROWDER. Of course not. Infiltration is a term which comes directly from military science, and which involves operations against an enemy, hostility. Our attitude toward trade unions and other such organizations is quite the opposite. It is one of complete and friendly cooperation for common purposes which are in the public interest.

Mr. ADAMSON. Congressman Thomas asked you a question concerning this article in the World Telegram of July 27, 1945, and he referred to the crisis confronting this country or to confront this country immediately following the war. Let me ask you if you know or believe there is any connection between the activities of members of the Communist Party on the one hand and the wave of strikes that we are having right now today?

Mr. BROWDER. You mean connection in the way of cause and effect?

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, whatever way you wish to characterize it. You are the witness. You tell me.

Mr. BROWDER. In such a general forum I would have to say "no."

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, suppose you were in a more secluded spot, then what would your answer be? After all, this is not a very big audience, Mr. Browder.

Mr. BROWDER. I think our audience is the Nation, and that we are trying, if we accept the premise on which congressional committees are set up, to try to inform the Nation accurately about particular problems; otherwise we have no excuse for being here.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, you imply that your answer would be different in private discussion.

Mr. BROWDER. I did not. That is a presumption on your part which has no relation to my answer.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, what did you mean by "less general forum"?

Mr. BROWDER. I didn't say "forum." I said "form."

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, let us change the form. Suppose you tell me whether or not you know of any such activity on the part of the members of the Communist Party relating to the strikes that we are having today?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not.

Mr. ADAMSON. And isn't it one of the principles of the Communist Party, part of their party activities, to foment and encourage strikes in certain circumstances?

Mr. BROWDER. To the best of my knowledge I believe it is not.

Mr. THOMAS. Might I ask a question right there?—Haven't you testified previously to this, that one of the weapons of the Communist Party was the general strike?

Mr. BROWDER. I have not.

Mr. THOMAS. Hasn't one of the weapons of the Communist Party been the general strike?

Mr. BROWDER. It has not.

Mr. THOMAS. Not only in this country but the Communist Party in other nations?

Mr. BROWDER. I can not answer for the Communists of other nations.

Mr. THOMAS. But you do state, though, that you have never in any pamphlet or any other writing or any public address before the Communists or otherwise, ever agitated the general strike as a weapon of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I never have.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Browder, I believe you stated a while ago, before the adjournment, that you would like to leave after today?

Mr. BROWDER. It would be a very great relief to me if I could finish today.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you come back on the 18th of October?

Mr. BROWDER. I will try to arrange it if you consider it necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. We will excuse you until that time.

Mr. BROWDER. Thank you.

Mr. ADAMSON. Ten o'clock on the 18th.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Stachel, will you be sworn?

Mr. BRODSKY. May I move my chair up closer to Mr. Stachel, so I can advise with him?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. BRODSKY. It would save a lot of time, because if he wants to consult with me you would simply have to wait till he comes back to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The policy of this committee, with all due regard, is to never recognize counsel in these hearings.

Mr. BRODSKY. It is also your policy, as it is everybody else's policy, to advise the witness that he has the right to consult with counsel? That is the policy of all committees.

The CHAIRMAN. This is not a legal committee.

Mr. BRODSKY. I didn't say it was. I say he has a right to consult with counsel. I am advising him.

The CHAIRMAN. I have already ruled.

Mr. BRODSKY. All right.

TESTIMONY OF JACOB A. STACHEL, NEW YORK CITY

(The witness was duly sworn by the Chairman.)

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Stachel, will you give your full name and home and business address for the record?

Mr. STACHEL. My full name is Jacob A. Stachel. Home address 203 West Ninety-fourth Street, Business address, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York City.

Mr. ADAMSON. Is the business address that you have given, the business address of the Daily Worker, Mr. Stachel?

Mr. STACHEL. Correct.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Stachel, are you a citizen of the United States?

Mr. STACHEL. Yes; I claimed citizenship on the date of my father's naturalization.

Mr. ADAMSON. And how long ago was your father naturalized?

Mr. STACHEL. Quite some time, over 20 years, I am sure that much—25 years probably.

Mr. ADAMSON. How old are you?

Mr. STACHEL. 44.

Mr. ADAMSON. How long have you resided in New York?

Mr. STACHEL. Since January 1911, when I came here.

Mr. ADAMSON. Is that when your father came here?

Mr. STACHEL. No, my father came here long before that, I believe.

Mr. ADAMSON. How long have you been employed by the Daily Worker?

Mr. STACHEL. For about 3 years.

Mr. ADAMSON. And what is your official title with the Daily Worker?

Mr. STACHEL. Member of the editorial staff.

Mr. ADAMSON. And are you one of the feature editorial writers regularly?

Mr. STACHEL. I am not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Just what type of work do you do? In other words, what are your duties? You say you are part of the editorial staff.

Mr. STACHEL. Well, I participate in discussions. I have duties. I read the papers and suggest items to be treated, and once in a while I also write articles or editorials.

Mr. ADAMSON. Is there any particular branch of the news, Mr. Stachel, in which you specialize?

Mr. STACHEL. Well, I am considered to know more about labor unions than most other questions that I handle.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then shall we say you are the labor consultant on the staff?

Mr. STACHEL. You might say that.

Mr. ADAMSON. And are you the only labor consultant on the editorial staff?

Mr. STACHEL. No; we have a labor editor.

Mr. ADAMSON. Are you his boss or is he your boss?

Mr. STACHEL. I don't put it either way. The editorial committee and the managing editor decide the work.

Mr. ADAMSON. How are you connected with the Communist Party, Mr. Stachel?

Mr. STACHEL. I am a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ADAMSON. How long have you been a member?

Mr. STACHEL. Since the fall of 1923.

Mr. ADAMSON. Did you establish your first connection with the Communist Party in New York?

Mr. STACHEL. In New York City.

Mr. ADAMSON. And have you been a member of any of the Communist organizations outside of New York?

Mr. STACHEL. I have not.

Mr. ADAMSON. All of your activities have been in connection with the New York Party? Is that correct?

Mr. STACHEL. I was 1 year in Detroit, 1930.

Mr. ADAMSON. And what was your connection in Detroit?

Mr. STACHEL. I was the organizer of the organization in Michigan at that time.

Mr. ADAMSON. You were the Communist Party organizer for the State of Michigan?

Mr. STACHEL. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. And it was part of your duty to secure subscriptions and to enhance the circulation of the Daily Worker?

Mr. STACHEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAMSON. And the circulation of the Daily Worker is one of the activities promoted by the members of the Party? Isn't that true?

Mr. STACHEL. The Daily Worker tries to get the full cooperation of the Communist organizations and of other labor organizations as well.

Mr. ADAMSON. And that is part of the activities of the party members, to enhance the circulation of the Daily Worker too? Isn't that true?

Mr. STACHEL. As a rule it is.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Stachel, you have heard the testimony of Mr. Browder, I believe?

Mr. STACHEL. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. You have been here the whole time?

Mr. STACHEL. I was.

Mr. ADAMSON. And did you attend the convention in the latter part of July in New York, this year?

Mr. STACHEL. I attended a number of sessions. I could not get into the opening session, and I missed a number of others because of my work, but I was present at probably at least 50 percent of the sessions. I was not a delegate.

Mr. ADAMSON. You were there merely as a party member?

Mr. STACHEL. I was there as an invited guest?

Mr. ADAMSON. Weren't you there rather in the nature of a reporter?

Mr. STACHEL. No; we had another person assigned as reporter.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you didn't write up, then, any of the articles?

Mr. STACHEL. I did not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Did you have a man who is specially assigned to that type of work on the Daily Worker?

Mr. STACHEL. What kind of work?

Mr. ADAMSON. Writing up reports of the meetings and conventions of the party.

Mr. STACHEL. No; different people are assigned to different jobs at different times.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to show you a newspaper article which has already been marked "Exhibit 7" here. Take a look at it, please. [Handing exhibit 7 to the witness.]

Mr. THOMAS. Is that taken from the Daily Worker?

Mr. ADAMSON. No; that is from the New York World Telegram.

Mr. STACHEL. I didn't read this fully now, but I recall most of it. I have read it before.

Mr. ADAMSON. I wanted to ask you if you had heard this matter discussed previous to the time this article was published?

Mr. STACHEL. I can't say that I did.

Mr. ADAMSON. You never heard of it before?

Mr. STACHEL. I have heard of the subject, but this particular article I don't recollect.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. STACHEL. I heard of it being published; oh, yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. As a matter of fact, the subject has been under discussion for 10 or 12 years, hasn't it?

Mr. THOMAS. To refresh our memory, what is the subject?

Mr. ADAMSON. I am sorry. I am referring to the article dated July 23, 1945, in the New York World Telegram, the headline reading "Davis Revives Red Negro Nation Plan." Can you answer that?

Mr. STACHEL. What is the question?

Mr. ADAMSON. The subject has been discussed at various times for many years?

Mr. STACHEL. Yes; I have heard it discussed previously.

Mr. ADAMSON. Over a period of many years?

Mr. STACHEL. Well, not in recent years—some time ago.

Mr. ADAMSON. You don't recall hearing any discussion this year about it?

Mr. STACHEL. Not prior to the writing of the article.

Mr. ADAMSON. Isn't it a fact that it was discussed at the convention the latter part of July?

Mr. STACHEL. I don't recall having heard the discussion at the convention, but it is possible that it was discussed while I was away.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you have any official title at the present time with the Communist Party?

Mr. STACHEL. I am a member of the national committee newly elected, and the national board.

Mr. ADAMSON. And do you do publicity work for the party?

Mr. STACHEL. I do not. That is something I learned through the newspapers. It surprised me a great deal.

Mr. ADAMSON. Since you became a member of the party, Mr. Stachel, in 1923, have you traveled extensively over the country?

Mr. STACHEL. Not extensively.

Mr. ADAMSON. Have you been to the Pacific coast?

Mr. STACHEL. Yes; I was there twice.

Mr. ADAMSON. And to Mexico?

Mr. STACHEL. No, I have never been in Mexico.

Mr. ADAMSON. How about Canada?

Mr. STACHEL. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. You have never been in Canada?

Mr. STACHEL. Not to my knowledge, except passing from Detroit to Buffalo by train.

Mr. ADAMSON. What is the Trade Union Unity League? Do you know?

Mr. STACHEL. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will you tell us about it?

Mr. STACHEL. The Trade Union Unity League was—it no longer exists—was an organization of trade unions in a number of industries for the central body. It was the central body of a number of trade unions in industry.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will you tell us a little more about their activities, their objectives?

Mr. STACHEL. Well, the bulk of the workers were unorganized in this country at the time when the Trade Union Unity League was formed. The object at that time was to organize workers in certain industries. Some unions were established with the automobile workers, shoe workers, food workers and a number of others, and jointly they formed through conventions the Trade Union Unity League. The object was to organize the unorganized in the United States.

Mr. ADAMSON. Isn't it a fact that you have done quite a lot of work in relation to organizational activities in the trade unions for the party?

Mr. STACHEL. I did some work.

Mr. ADAMSON. And it is one of the objectives of the party to obtain as many members as possible in the trade unions? Isn't that true?

Mr. STACHEL. The first objective of the Communist Party is to obtain as many members as possible everywhere, but it particularly prides itself in including members of the workers.

Mr. ADAMSON. It particularly strives to obtain members who are members of trade unions?

Mr. STACHEL. Yes; and when we come across workers who are not in unions, we urge them to join unions.

Mr. LANDIS. Do you believe in the continued cooperation of labor and capital through the reconversion period?

Mr. STACHEL. I do.

Mr. LANDIS. Do you believe our American system of government is the best system in the world?

Mr. STACHEL. I believe there are many things that can and must be improved.

Mr. LANDIS. I mean today.

Mr. STACHEL. I am talking about today. There are many things that can and should be improved.

Mr. LANDIS. I will ask you this question: Don't you think we have the best system of government on earth today? I admit that it could be improved.

Mr. STACHEL. I can answer that question only in this way: In some respects the United States Government is, as you say, the best in the world, and in other respects, and growing out of that we have many, very many acute problems which presently must be solved.

Mr. LANDIS. Could you name a country that has a better system than we have, that has got as high a standard of living? Haven't we got the highest standard of living in the world?

Mr. STACHEL. I think we have the highest standard of living in the world, but I think the standard of living is being threatened now by unemployment, and there are certain causes for this, and one of the objects of our movement is to strive to help solve the problem so that the great accumulation of wealth and culture that our country has can be used to the full advantage of the working of the whole system for full employment and for higher standard of living even than we have today. In my opinion the standard cannot remain stationary. It must either decline or go forward. We are fighting for it to go forward. That is why we are fighting for 60,000,000 jobs and many other aspects of full employment.

Mr. LANDIS. Do you believe in revolution, the overthrow of the government by revolution?

Mr. STACHEL. I do not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let me ask you the same question I asked Mr. Browder. Do you regard the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as the greatest, most powerful, and most dependable champion of freedom and equality for all peoples in the coalition known as the United Nations?

Mr. STACHEL. If you would permit me to answer without "yes" or "no", I think you will get much farther.

Mr. ADAMSON. Can't you answer "yes" or "no", whether you agree with that statement? And you can qualify it as you wish.

Mr. STACHEL. I would answer that I agree with it substantially for the following reasons: I don't want to underestimate—and don't think we should—the power and the importance and the role that our country must play if we are to have world peace. We are living in a very dangerous moment. Everybody knows that. We have won the war but we have got a lot of things to solve before we can secure the peace. One of the reasons why I agree with this statement, and I replied in the affirmative because in our country there are still forces who are working to upset the results of the victory, while in Russia they are not. There the people are united behind the government on one policy, while in our country there are still forces that are trying to upset the basis for our victory and move to the opposite direction.

Mr. ADAMSON. Can you tell us what you mean by "unity"? I would like to know what you regard as "unity" that you referred to in Russia, that you would like to have here.

Mr. STACHEL. All right, I will be glad to give it. I was particularly impressed with the statement recently by Senator Taft when he accused those who want the full employment bill with working for socialism, and he stated that only under socialism can you have full employment, and those of you who want full employment had better fight for socialism. In the Soviet Union there is socialism, and as we know, there is no problem of unemployment there. It is a problem of labor shortage, for many reasons which I do not have to go into now. In our country there are people willing to see unemployment because of the fear of socialism. Personally I believe socialism will come to every country in the world, including our own ultimately, but I do believe we can do a great deal to provide full employment even under the present system. Those who deny that, in my opinion are not helping the present system. But the point I want to make is there so much fear of socialism and of the workers that some would rather have chaos and unemployment rather than face what they consider the danger of socialism, therefore they can not really have full unity with the workers. The workers want jobs, and they are not afraid of the consequences of

the workers getting jobs in the Soviet Union. That is why you can have full employment in the Soviet Union while we can not achieve it here.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you prefer to substitute the form of government that now exists in Russia for our form of government here? Is that correct?

Mr. STACHEL. No; I would not prefer to substitute. In my opinion it is impossible to substitute the system of one country in another, and whatever system finally evolves in this country, though based upon certain principles common to all socialism, will nonetheless have a tone imprint growing out of American conditions, American problems, and the impulses and the impacts of the moment when this communication takes place.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is all I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will recess until a quarter after 3, at which time we will meet in executive session.

Mr. ADAMSON. I wish to say this for the record. I wish to inform Mr. Joseph Brodsky, attorney for Benjamin Davis, Jr., that the committee has decided to excuse the witness, Davis, to a future date to be fixed by the chairman, and due notice will be given to Mr. Brodsky and to his client.

Mr. BROESKY. Are you through with him now? He can go back to New York? You don't want him any more?

Mr. ADAMSON. That is right.

(Whereupon, at 2:45 p. m., the public hearing adjourned.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *Wednesday, October 17, 1945.*

The committee met at 11 a. m., Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the committee be in order, please.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, will you be sworn?

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, NEW YORK, N. Y.

(On administration of the oath by the chairman the witness affirmed.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I at this time introduce a short statement?

The CHAIRMAN. We will give you the opportunity at some later time to say whatever you desire to say, but at the present time we prefer you to answer questions by the counsel of the committee, and then if you desire to make a statement we will be glad to hear it.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to protest against this entire proceeding.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all right. We understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Adamson.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will you give your full name, home address and business address to the reporter?

Mr. FOSTER. William Z. Foster, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York, business address; home address, 1040 Melton Avenue, New York.

Mr. ADAMSON. Are you a citizen of the United States, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Where were you born?

Mr. FOSTER. In Taunton, Mass.

Mr. ADAMSON. And are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And do you hold any official position in that Party?

Mr. FOSTER. National chairman.

Mr. ADAMSON. How long have you been affiliated with the Communist Party, either as an officer or member?

Mr. FOSTER. Since 1921.

Mr. ADAMSON. When was the Communist Party really organized in the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. The Communist Party was organized originally in the United States in 1919. It was dissolved 2 years ago.

Mr. ADAMSON. Have you ever belonged to the Socialist Party too?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And did you ever hold any official position with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. By the way, do you still belong to the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. What happened to your membership in that organization, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. My membership expired because I was no longer working at a trade.

Mr. ADAMSON. Weren't you expelled from the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I was not.

Mr. ADAMSON. No official action was ever taken against you as a member by that organization?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing beyond notifying me that my dues had expired, I was no longer working at the trade and could no longer hold membership in that particular organization, which requires that you must work at the trade in order to be a member.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, do you remember testifying before another committee on that point as follows:

"I did not leave. I was expelled from the American Federation of Labor as part of the general campaign of the leaders of the American Federation of Labor to get rid of every element in the American Federation of Labor that tried to build it into an organization that would really advance the interests of the worker."

Do you remember that?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. It had that element in it, but the technical basis of my leaving the American Federation of Labor was as I stated, that my dues had expired. In the case of other individuals they would have made an exception and allowed me to continue as a member, no doubt—without doubt.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was your testimony at that time taken under oath?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And which testimony is true and correct now, the testimony you gave them, that you were expelled, or the testimony that you now give, that you were not expelled?

Mr. FOSTER. They are both correct. Anybody else would not have been dropped. I was dropped. The rule was enforced against me because of my affiliation. Against other people it would not have been enforced.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, when were you elected national chairman of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. At the recent convention 2 or 3 months ago.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was that last July?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. In New York?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. And had you been an officer of the Communist Political Association?

Mr. FOSTER. I was a member of the national committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. You were not an officer?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, yes; I was also a member of the national board.

Mr. ADAMSON. What was your title?

Mr. FOSTER. That was it, vice president. All members of the board are vice presidents.

Mr. ADAMSON. What was the first official position you ever held with the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. Member of the executive committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. How long ago was that?

Mr. FOSTER. 1921.

Mr. ADAMSON. And from that you then went up the ladder, didn't you, in the organization? Tell us the official positions you held.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I have been a member of the secretariat of the Communist Party, and national chairman.

Mr. ADAMSON. Tell us what you means by "the secretariat"?

Mr. FOSTER. The secretariat at present consists of four people.

Mr. ADAMSON. Who are they?

Mr. FOSTER. Their names have appeared in our press. They are Jean Dennis, Bob Thompson, myself, and I forget the other—my memory is not so good this morning.

Mr. RANKIN. Was Hugh Dent one of them?

Mr. FOSTER. No; Hugh Dent was not. John Williamson was the other.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the secretariat exist today?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And has it existed since 1919?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it has existed since 3 months ago.

Mr. ADAMSON. What are the functions of the secretariat?

Mr. FOSTER. The functions of the secretaries are to carry on the work of the party between meetings of the national board.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you say that the secretariat manages the party and announces its policies?

Mr. FOSTER. Only in a limited degree. The national board is above the secretary, and the national committee is above the national board.

Mr. ADAMSON. And what is your national board? Tell us how many members there are.

Mr. FOSTER. There are 11 members on the national board.

Mr. ADAMSON. Are they elected by vote at your convention?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right, by vote of the national committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. And are they selected from different districts in the country?

Mr. FOSTER. Not necessarily.

Mr. ADAMSON. They might all be from one area.

Mr. FOSTER. Some of them are and some are not.

Mr. ADAMSON. I believe you told us that you had belonged to the Socialist Party at one time?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you regard the Communist Party today, as reconstituted in the United States, as being in the same relative position with regard to Socialism as the old party?

Mr. FOSTER. Not necessarily.

Mr. ADAMSON. It is true, isn't it, that about 2 years ago the Communist Party as a political party was dissolved by action of one of your conventions?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. ADAMSON. Were you present at that convention?

Mr. FOSTER. I was.

Mr. ADAMSON. And what official part did you take in the convention?

Mr. FOSTER. It was not a—yes, it was a convention, and I was chairman of it in the opening session.

Mr. ADAMSON. And at that convention what other action did they take besides dissolving the party?

Mr. FOSTER. They worked out a policy and elected a national committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. Didn't they organize a political association?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. ADAMSON. And that political association—what relation does it have to the principles of the old party?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it adopted a new program.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you say you had a convention in July of this last summer in New York. That was about the 26th of July, was it?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. And at that convention what official action was taken concerning the association?

Mr. FOSTER. The Association was dissolved and the Communist Party was organized.

Mr. ADAMSON. Can you tell us—pardon me, I assume that you were also present as an official at the convention this last summer in July? Is that so?

Mr. FOSTER. Most of the sessions; yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. In other words, you took an official part in the proceedings?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. Can you tell us now why the party was dissolved and the association was formed years ago? What are the principal reasons?

Mr. FOSTER. Why the party was formed now?

Mr. ADAMSON. No; why the party was dissolved back in 1943 and the association was formed in its place?

Mr. FOSTER. Because it was felt by the party that a new policy was necessary.

Mr. ADAMSON. Give us the principal distinctions between the old policy and the new policy that you wanted to accept, of the Association as compared with the Party?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, this is carried in all our publications and is rather an extensive compilation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we might as well understand right now that he has not answered the question. That is evasive.

Mr. ADAMSON. Can you give us the principal points of difference? In other words, what could the association do that the old party could not have done?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the witness a question. We might just as well pin him down and find out where we are at.

The CHAIRMAN. One at a time. Suppose we let counsel finish, and then I will call on the members of the committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will you answer that question, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. State it again, please.

Mr. ADAMSON. What could the association do that the old party could not have done just as well?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know the import of that question.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, Mr. Foster, let us go back again. What were the moving reasons for dissolving the party and substituting an association for the party?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the principal reason was that the party became convinced, as a result of the Teheran Conference—

Mr. ADAMSON (interposing). Back in 1943?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right—that Teheran Conference, consisting of President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin—that the decisive sections of American capitalism had adopted a policy of loyal cooperation with the rest of the great nations of the world and was prepared to undertake not only the carrying through of the war to a complete victory against fascism, but also jointly to bring about an economic reconstruction of the world, and on this basis the new party built its policy—that is, the association.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let us get back to the original question now. What was there in the program to which you have referred that could not have been followed by the party but could be accomplished better by an association?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the Teheran Conference represented a higher stage of the war struggle in general, and for the first time I think it laid down a basis of very definite cooperation between the great powers that were conducting the war on our side, and this naturally raised the whole question of postwar cooperation to a higher stage. On the basis of this, the association changed its policy to meet these new conditions, or in an effort to meet the new conditions.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let us forget the association for a moment. Can you tell us what differences—by that I mean substantial differences—exist between the Communist Party as reconstituted today, and the old Communist Party that existed prior to, say, 1940, in fact back prior to 1943?

Mr. FOSTER. We have a totally new world situation at the present time, and the policies of the Communist Party of 1943 did not comprehend this situation, had nothing to do with it, and our present policies are based upon the new world situation. For example the question of reconversion and many other questions that did not exist in our Party in 1940, like other parties, had nothing in their program about this situation.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, Mr. Foster, referring back to one of your previous definitions of communism, which I believe you gave under oath, you drew a parallel or distinction between socialism and communism. I want to quote a few words from your testimony:

"Socialism. The socialism of the Socialist Party is a system of defending capitalism under the pretext of gradually reforming capitalism into socialism. The Communist movement is a movement for the abolition of capitalism and reconstruction of society on a basis of production for use, the ownership of industries by the people, and the abolition of the whole system of exploitation of workers, such as exists in the United States and in the other capitalistic countries."

Now, is that definition which you gave several years ago true and correct in your opinion, today?

Mr. FOSTER. Quite correct, with one exception, namely, that there are now very considerable sections of the Socialist Party in various parts of the world who are very definitely moving actually for the establishment of socialism, which the old social democracy never undertook at any time in its history.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you think then that there has been any change in the policy of the Communist organizations, or do you attribute that to a change in the governments of the so-called capitalistic countries?

Mr. FOSTER. All parties constantly change their policies, the Communist Party included.

Mr. ADAMSON. At the present time, Mr. Foster, let me ask you, have you any connection with an organization called the Trade Union Unity League?

Mr. FOSTER. No; there is no such organization.

Mr. ADAMSON. Was there such an organization?

Mr. FOSTER. There was many years ago.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you say that that is entirely out of existence now?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. What subdivision or department of the party conducts or contacts your activities in connection with trade union matters?

Mr. FOSTER. We have no division of our party for that work.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you know a gentleman by the name of Stachel?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. What is his position?

Mr. FOSTER. He is a member of our national board.

Mr. ADAMSON. Is he elected from New York?

Mr. FOSTER. No; he is elected by the national committee without regard to his home.

Mr. ADAMSON. On this national board do those members have any home territory or districts?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. They are elected entirely without regard to where they live?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. ADAMSON. I may be wrong, but I understood Mr. Stachel to say in his testimony here a couple of weeks ago that he did have some relation with trade-union activities.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, our whole party has relation to trade union activities in so far as we encourage every step of the trade unions for improved conditions, for shorter hours, for the organization of the unorganized—anything and everything that strengthens the trade unions. We consider the trade unions as the very foundation of American democracy, and without the trade unions we would have Fascism in the United States, therefore we do everything in our power to strengthen the trade unions in every conceivable way.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a suggestion, in view of the fact that this conference has been going on for some time, and the members undoubtedly have a number of questions they would like to ask, and I think this is a good point to break in on it.

Mr. ADAMSON. May I ask him just one more question that I want in order to connect up here? Then I want to give the members an opportunity to ask questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, do you remember identifying socialism as a Fascist doctrine?

Mr. FOSTER. Socialism as a Fascist doctrine?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Never.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, let me read this to you: "The Socialist is a Fascist."

Mr. FOSTER. That means the social democrat.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, now, what did you mean? That is what I am trying to get at. You don't remember making that statement?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't remember where I said it; no.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you like to see it?

Mr. FOSTER. Not necessarily. I can explain that very easily.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let me ask you this question. Did you make this distinction or did you give this definition:

"Socialism seeks to maintain capitalism, not to establish socialism. The Labor Government of Great Britain, which is a Socialist government, undertakes to maintain the British Empire just as resolutely as Stanley Baldwin. In order to do so it shoots down the Indian peasants just as brazenly as the Baldwin government did, cuts wages of British workers, speeds them up."

Do you remember that description?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't remember that particular description but it was correct.

Mr. ADAMSON. Just one more question now. At the convention in New York—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). I am speaking of the old Labor Government that existed some dozen years ago.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, certainly. By the mention of Mr. Baldwin's name I take it that you would know it was several years ago.

At the convention in July Mr. Browder, I believe, was not reelected to the official position that he held with the Communist Association? Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMSON. And I believe at that convention Mr. Browder said that if he were not reelected he intended to appeal the decision of the convention. Do you know whether or not he took such an appeal?

Mr. FOSTER. I know nothing about it.

Mr. ADAMSON. You don't know what he did?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no idea.

Mr. ADAMSON. What organization or tribunal exists to which such an appeal would go?

Mr. FOSTER. He might take it up with the rank and file of our party. That is the only institution that has anything to do with the shaping of our policies.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well. I will suspend now.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Foster, you say you joined the Communist Party in 1921?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. RANKIN. You were a member of the Communist Party until it was abolished or suspended by Earl Browder in 1932. You referred to Communism as syndicalism, did you not, in a pamphlet you published?

Mr. FOSTER. Communism as syndicalism?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't think so.

Mr. RANKIN. You issued a booklet called Syndicalism. By Earl C. Ford and William Z. Foster, in 1932, did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not.

Mr. RANKIN. You knew it was issued, did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not.

Mr. RANKIN. You wrote that pamphlet, you and Ford wrote that pamphlet, did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. In 1932?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it was published in 1932. I don't remember what year it was written, but it was published in 1932.

Mr. FOSTER. We did not.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me read you some of the things you put in there.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me get you straight on that first. That pamphlet was written 33 years ago, not in 1932.

Mr. RANKIN. You wrote it at that time, then? You wrote it 33 years ago?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. RANKIN. You have changed your mind on these things since that time?

Mr. FOSTER. On many things; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me read you some of the principal things you said in that pamphlet at that time, and I will ask you whether or not you still have that opinion. You were a leader of the syndicalist movement at that time, one of the leaders, were you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that since writing that pamphlet I have changed my entire political outlook, and that to undertake to produce a lot of old writings that were written a generation ago is nonsense, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it might be important to know what particular change has taken place, and the reasons for it.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to protest against bringing up old pamphlets that I have repudiated long ago as not representing my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the committee you have not done so, and you have not given your reasons, and you are being given an opportunity now if you want to repudiate it, and your reasons therefor. I think the question is pertinent.

Mr. FOSTER. I say the whole line of the pamphlet represents a different position than I take now.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I want to ask him. I want to read him some things in that pamphlet and see if he has changed his mind as to them, and why. On page 9 of this pamphlet says:

"The syndicalist is characterized by the harmony that exists between his theories and his tactics. He realizes that the capitalist class is his mortal enemy, that it must be overthrown, the wages system abolished and the new

society he has outlined established, if he is to live; and he is proceeding to the accomplishment of these tasks with unparallel directness. He allows nothing to swerve him from his course and lead him in an indirection.

"The syndicalist knows that capitalism is organized robbery and he consistently considers and treats capitalists as thieves plying their trade. He knows they have no more right to the wealth they have amassed than a burglar has to his loot, and the idea of expropriating them without remuneration seems as natural to him as for the footpads' victim to take back his stolen property without paying the footpad for it. From long experience he has learned that the so-called legal and inalienable rights of man are but pretenses with which to deceive working men; that in reality 'rights' are only enjoyed by those capable of enforcing them." The word "rights" is in quotation marks. Continuing this says:

"He knows that in modern society, as in all ages, might is right, and that the capitalists hold the industries they have stolen and daily perpetrate the robbery of the wages system simply because they have the economic power to do so. He has fathomed the current system of ethics and morals, and knows them to be just so many auxiliaries to the capitalist class. Consequently, he has cast them aside and has placed his relations with the capitalists upon a basis of naked power.

"In his choice of weapons to fight his capitalist enemies, the syndicalist is no more careful to select those that are fair, just, or civilized than is a householder attacked in the night by a burglar. He knows he is engaged in a life and death struggle with an absolutely lawless and unscrupulous enemy, and considers his tactics only from the standpoint of their effectiveness. With him the end justifies the means. Whether his tactics be legal and moral or not, does not concern him, so long as they are effective. He knows that the laws, as well as the current code of morals, are made by his mortal enemies, and considers himself about as much bound by them as a householder would himself by regulations regarding burglary adopted by an association of housebreakers. Consequently, he ignores them insofar as he is able and it suits his purposes. He proposes to develop, regardless of capitalist conceptions of legality, fairness, right, and so forth, a greater power than his capitalist enemies have; and then to wrest from them by force the industries they have stolen from him by force and duplicity, and to put an end forever to the wages system. He proposes to bring about the revolution by the general strike."

Have you changed your mind since you wrote that, Mr. Foster?

MR. FOSTER. I told you that I had, and I want to protest against the reading of these pamphlets. This is just cheap red-baiting and the purpose of it is to develop a red hysteria in the country, to create a smoke screen behind which the American reactionary forces can carry on their sinister activities in America, and their imperialistic programs abroad, designed for the domination of the world. I don't think that this committee should demean itself by such tactics as this, bringing up pamphlets that had been repudiated many years ago. I represent a totally different line than is in that pamphlet.

The CHAIRMAN. You were asked a very simple question.

MR. FOSTER. I told you that I repudiated the whole pamphlet in the sense that I have taken that as a Communist outlook.

MR. LANDIS. I think right here, Mr. Chairman, when he is talking about imperialism he ought to say whether he says that Truman is an imperialist.

MR. RANKIN. Wait a minute. I am questioning him.

MR. LANDIS. Right here, where he is talking about imperialism.

MR. FOSTER. Direct your questions to something recent, not an antediluvian pamphlet.

MR. RANKIN. I am going to ask you some questions. Don't worry about that.

MR. LANDIS. Let him give his answer right here. Will you yield for that question?

MR. RANKIN. I will yield for that question only.

MR. LANDIS. I noticed in a paper here on September 24th, "Foster scores imperialism of Truman."

MR. RANKIN. You changed that statement, did you?

MR. FOSTER. I don't know what the headline says, but I will be very glad to state my position.

MR. LANDIS. Did you take the position in your New York speech that Truman and the administration was imperialistic?

MR. FOSTER. I said it was inherently imperialistic, and I would like to state why.

MR. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't propose—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). Mr. Chairman, I propose that we drop this nonsense and talk about something real. This gentleman has asked me a real question and I will be glad to answer it instead of this nonsense that Mr. Rankin is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will determine what is nonsense. We are not concerned about your opinion of the question. What we are seeking is the truth.

Mr. FOSTER. But I am not going to be a party to a lot of red baiting here, and I am going to protest against it. If the gentlemen of this committee will ask me political questions I will be very happy to answer in full, but I am not going to allow myself to be made an instrument of red baiting such as Mr. Rankin is undertaking now, and I am going to denounce it every time he starts.

The CHAIRMAN. By that do you mean that you are red baiting when you made these statements that are being read to you?

Mr. FOSTER. I wrote that pamphlet 33 years ago. I believed it when I wrote it. Now I have changed my opinion. I am a Communist, and Communists are not syndicalists.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Mr. Landis has asked a question that has not gotten an answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed to answer the question of Mr. Landis.

Mr. FOSTER. There can be no doubt that at the present time the great trusts and monopolies of the United States are pressing for a program of aggressive imperialism.

Mr. THOMAS. The question had to do with the Truman administration, not about the trusts and corporations.

Mr. FOSTER. Imperialism is a very big matter, and I will come to it very directly.

The CHAIRMAN. If I understood the question it was whether or not you denounced the President of the United States and the administration as being imperialistic. Did you or did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to state that is a very important question, what is my impression, my analysis of the administration, and I think I have a right to answer the gentleman's question in full. I don't intend to go into any big speech.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a simple question, whether in that speech in September of this year you made such a reference to the administration of this Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I said many things in that speech. I talked for 40 minutes in that speech before I came to that part, and I would like to say what I did say in that regard.

Mr. THOMAS. We don't want you to take 40 minutes to answer it. It won't take but just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question was asked whether that was part of your speech.

Mr. FOSTER. I stand upon my rights. If you are going to demand that I characterize the Truman administration—

Mr. THOMAS. (interposing). Did you characterize it as an imperialist administration?

Mr. FOSTER. I made certain characterizations of the Truman administration in the midst of the speech outlining the position of American imperialism in general, and I cannot characterize the Truman administration without stating the policies of American imperialism in general.

The CHAIRMAN. Then do we understand that you say you did characterize the Truman administration as being imperialistic?

Mr. FOSTER. I say this—now, you may proceed to shut me off from stating—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). We are not trying to shut you off.

Mr. FOSTER (continuing). From stating the relation of Mr. Truman to American imperialism, and you can not force me into making some offhand characterization of the Truman administration that is just extracted from a 40-minute speech. I will be very pleased to tell this committee precisely my conception of the relation of President Truman to American imperialism if I am permitted to do so. Undoubtedly the great monopolies, or certainly the bulk of them in the country, are pressing for a policy of aggressive American imperialism, and the spokesmen of these monopolies—

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). May I be permitted to go ahead and ask these questions? I yielded for that question only, and I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't yield. I think I have some rights here. I don't yield to Mr. Rankin. I demand the right to answer this question.

Mr. THOMAS. Try to answer it, and try to answer it briefly, if you can, Mr. Foster, because I would like to get an answer.

Mr. FOSTER. If it had not been for all these interruptions you would have had your answer by now.

Mr. THOMAS. Go ahead.

Mr. FOSTER. And that characteristic spokesman of this drive of American imperialism to dominate the world under the present situation—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Under the present Administration?

Mr. FOSTER. Under the present situation I said—are such men such spokesmen as Mr. Hoover, Mr. Dewey, Mr. Dulles, Mr. Vandenberg.

Mr. THOMAS. They are not in the Truman administration. They are in another age.

Mr. FOSTER. That's what you think. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. I hope you are right.

Mr. FOSTER. The fact of the matter is that the voice of Mr. Hoover is more potent in the Congress at the present time than the voice of Mr. Truman, both with regard to domestic policies and national policies as well.

Now, the relation of the Truman administration to this drive for American imperialism to dominate the situation, I think it is a policy of yielding to the pressure of these imperialist forces. Mr. Truman has pledged himself to carry out the Roosevelt policies, foreign and domestic, and in so far as he does that he has the hearty support of the Communist Party, but certainly within the past couple of months particularly, whether it is with regard to Germany, whether it is with regard to any phase of our foreign policy, the Truman Administration is undoubtedly yielding to the pressure of these imperialist forces. The appointment of Mr. Byrnes as Secretary of State, undoubtedly was a tremendous concession to the imperialists of the United States, and the fact that he selected Mr. Dulles as his chief advisor to London is evidence of that fact, and in my opinion it was a bad day for the United Nations and for world democracy in general when Mr. Byrnes assumed the Secretaryship of State of the United States.

Mr. LANDIS. I want to ask him to say "yes" or "no" to this question.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course I won't say "yes" or "no."

Mr. LANDIS (reading): "Mr. Foster in an address proposed for delivery in observation of the party's twenty-sixth anniversary said among what he termed 'imperialist' foreign policies of the Administration was the trend toward making the military control of Japan purely an American affair under the ultra-conservative General MacArthur, instead of the concern of the whole United Nations."

Mr. FOSTER. That is right. Not only I say that, but progressives generally throughout the United States say it.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask Mr. Foster one more question at this point. In this pamphlet which he wrote he said 32 years ago—how old were you at that time, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. I was 33, or thereabouts.

Mr. RANKIN. When you were 33 years old, under the heading of "The general strike in the armed forces" you said, "Once the general strike is in active operation, the greatest obstacle to its success will be armed forces of capitalism—soldiers, police, detectives, etc. This formidable force will be used energetically by the capitalists to break the general strike. The syndicalists have given much study to the problem presented by this force and have found the solution for it. Their proposed tactics are very different from those used by rebels in former revolutions. They are not going to mass themselves and allow themselves to be slaughtered by capitalism's trained murderers in the orthodox way. There is a safer, more effective and more modern method. They are going to defeat the armed forces by disorganizing and demoralizing them."

"A fruitful source of this disorganization will be the extreme difficulty the armed forces will experience in securing supplies and transportation. Modern armies, to be effective, must have immense arsenals, power works and other industrial establishments behind them to furnish them their supplies of ammunition, arms, food and clothing. They also must have the railroads constantly at their disposal for transportation. When the general strike has halted these industries the army will be stricken with paralysis. Another source of disorganization will be the division of the armed forces into minute detachments to guard the many beleaguered gates of capitalism. The strikers, or revolutionists, will be everywhere, and will everywhere seize or disable whatever capitalist property they can lay their hands on. To protect this property the armed forces will have to be divided into myriad of guards and scattered along the thousands of miles of railroad and around the many public buildings, bridges, factories, and so forth. The wealthy capitalists themselves will also need generous guards. The most important industries, such as transportation, mining, etc., will have

to be operated in some manner. To do this will require many thousands more of soldiers and police.

"The result will be that the armed forces will be minutely subdivided, and through the loss of the solidarity and discipline, from whence they derive their strength, they will cease to be a fighting organization. They will degenerate into a mass of armed individuals scattered far and wide over the country. These individuals can be easily overwhelmed and disarmed, or what is more likely, they will be mostly working men and in sympathy with the general strike, induced to join the ranks of their striking fellow workers. Once the disorganization of the armed forces is complete the revolutionists will seize the unprotected industries and proceed to reorganize society."

Now, you say you were 33 years old when you wrote that, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. Approximately.

Mr. RANKIN. Approximately 33 years old. Do you see any analogy between that procedure and the procedure outlined by the Communist International and the Communist Party today?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course. The Communists have a fundamentally different line. Not only that, but they are in conflict with the syndicalists all over the world. This pamphlet in no sense represents my opinions, and you understand that perfectly well.

Mr. RANKIN. When did you change?

Mr. FOSTER. When I became a Communist—and before that, in fact.

Mr. RANKIN. And this is the first time you ever openly repudiated this pamphlet, isn't it?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I have repudiated it many times.

Mr. RANKIN. Now I will read further in this pamphlet, and see what you have to say about this.

Mr. FOSTER. Why don't you talk about something of today?

Mr. RANKIN. We are going to bring this all down and show the connection with the present Communist program.

On sabotage you go on to say in this pamphlet: "Next to the partial strike, the most effective weapon used by syndicalists in their daily warfare on capitalism is sabotage. Sabotage is a very general term. It is used to describe all those tactics, save the boycott and the strike proper; which are used by workers to wring concessions from their employers by inflicting losses on them through the stopping or slowing down of industry, turning out of poor products, etc. These tactics, and consequently the forms of sabotage, are very numerous. Many of them are closely related in character. Often two or more kinds of sabotage are used simultaneously or in conjunction with the strike.

"Perhaps the most widely practised form of sabotage is the restriction by the workers of their output. Disgruntled workers all over the world instinctively and continually practise this form of sabotage, which is often referred to as 'soldiering.'"

Then you go ahead to describe here how you would organize to sabotage. Does that comport with the program of the Communist party of today?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. RANKIN. You were 33 years old, you say, when you wrote this, and you were fully cognizant of what you were doing. You knew full well what you were driving at at that time, did you not.

Mr. FOSTER. I wrote that. I wrote the book. I have repudiated it a thousand times.

Mr. RANKIN. This pamphlet that you wrote 33 years ago was driving towards revolution in this country, wasn't it? That was the object of it, was to stir up revolution in this country?

Mr. FOSTER. That is perfectly obvious if you can understand English.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand English fairly well. Your object at that time—and you were 33 years old—in writing this stuff and publishing it and sending it through the mails and all over this country, was to stir up a revolution to overthrow this Government, wasn't it?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that we talk about realities today. Here is a pamphlet that is not endorsed by the Communists, that has nothing to do with the present situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, you occupy a position today as head of a political party. I think your utterances at any time during your mature life are material to this committee's understanding, with the explanation that you desire to give as to whether or not you embrace those views today.

Mr. FOSTER. I stated it a dozen times already that I have repudiated them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, what I want to show is that at that time he was not only advocating, he was practising revolution, and that the Communist Party today has merely changed in name. We propose to show before we get through that his program is to overthrow this Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Abraham Lincoln advocated revolution. Thomas Jefferson advocated revolution, and many others advocated revolution. So what?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me read you another paragraph:

"The syndicalist is as unscrupulous in his choice of weapons to fight his everyday battles as for his final struggle with capitalism. He allows no considerations of legality, religion, patriotism, honor, duty, etc., to stand in the way of his adoption of effective tactics. The only sentiment he knows is loyalty to the interests of the working class. He is in utter revolt against capitalism in all its phases."

Communism is opposed to capitalism in all its phases, is it not? Your Communist Party today is dedicated to the overthrow of what it calls the "capitalist system," isn't it?

Mr. FOSTER. Communism lives under capitalism and makes the best of it, and propagates—

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes; we do. We undertake to improve the conditions of the masses as much as is possible under the capitalist system, but we at the same time—

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). You go on to say here—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Let him finish.

Mr. FOSTER. But at the same time we point out to the worker the necessity of the eventual establishment of socialism. Our advocacy of socialism is purely in an educational form, and the United States Supreme Court has held that this is legal, such advocacy of socialism; and in fact, I think this whole committee here in this kind of an inquisitorial examination of the Communist Party is in flagrant violation of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Schneiderman case and is entirely out of place. The activities that the Communist Party are carrying on are strictly within the law, and Mr. Rankin knows that and is deliberately trying to use this committee for his notoriously reactionary purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, the simple question was asked you whether or not the Communist Party today advocates the abolition of the capitalistic system in this country.

Mr. FOSTER. I answered that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it or not?

Mr. FOSTER. I answered that the Communist Party points out to the workers the necessity for socialism, and undertakes—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). That is not an answer to the question. What does it mean?

Mr. FOSTER. What does it mean? It means the abolition of capitalism, of course, and the establishing of socialism.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, you advocate the abolition of capitalism, which is the American economic system?

Mr. FOSTER. Not the American system. Capitalism is not an American economic system. Capitalism is a world economic system, not American.

Mr. RANKIN. You also advocate communism in this country, and communism advocates the overthrow of the Government, doesn't it?

Mr. FOSTER. Change in our form of government.

Mr. RANKIN. Just a minute now. Make up your mind. What you want is overthrow or change in form?

Mr. FOSTER. Every day that Congress meets it is changing the form of our government.

Mr. RANKIN. Make up your mind which one the Communists advocate.

Mr. FOSTER. Every day that Congress meets it is changing the form of our government more or less.

Mr. RANKIN. What you propose to do is to get rid of the present Constitution of the United States, is it?

Mr. FOSTER. That is not so.

Mr. RANKIN. And you also propose to set up various Soviets over the country, do you not, divide up the country in Soviet states, Communist states?

Mr. FOSTER. The Communist Party—first of all, the Communist Party, as I have stated, undertakes under the capitalist system to protect the interests of the workers, not only the workers but all other sections of society, with every

means within its power under capitalism, and it proposes at the same time that the capitalist system is a decadent system, that historically it is on its way out from the world scene, and people must begin to look forward to a system of socialism. The capitalist system has produced two world wars.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not responsive to the question. The time has arrived when the House is in session, Mr. Foster. We will have to take an adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning unless you have some valid reason why you cannot appear here.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to read my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You can't do it now, but we will give you an opportunity to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give it to the press, then.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, and we will be glad to have you put it in the record of this committee any time you desire, and unless you have some valid reason why you cannot do it, we will ask you to be with us in the morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. THOMAS. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I want to know, if we meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, whether or not we can resume questioning by the members?

The CHAIRMAN. By the members of the committee. You will be next in order.

(Mr. Foster submitted the following paper:)

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

I wish to protest indignantly against the assumption of this committee that Communists are un-American. Contrary to this, we Communists yield to nobody in the patriotic defense of American national interests.

During the war, with America's fate at stake, we had over 12,000 of our members in the armed services, and on the home front we loyally supported labor's no-strike pledge and spared no effort to achieve maximum war production.

For a generation the Communists have been unsparing in their efforts to strengthen the trade unions, the very foundation of American democracy.

Every piece of progressive legislation incorporating the real American spirit of democracy has always had the ardent support of the Communists.

In the best American tradition we have uncompromisingly fought every form of racial and religious discrimination.

We are especially proud of our long fight for full economic, political and social equality for the Negro people, without which there cannot be true democracy in the United States.

The Communists are the most resolute of all fighters against Fascism, which is the enemy of everything truly American.

It was in the deepest American national interest that we Communists worked long and diligently for close and friendly cooperative relations between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R., without which cooperation we would have lost the war and would not win the peace.

It is also in the most basic American interest that we Communists are now warning the American people against the dangerous attempts of reactionaries here to force the United States into a path of imperialist world domination.

And history will show that in proposing a system of socialism to take the place of decadent capitalism, the breeder of economic chaos, Fascism and war, we are thereby advancing the most fundamental of all American national interests.

We Communists are proud of our record of Americanism, the Americanism of the people, not the trusts, the Americanism of democracy, peace and progress.

The present House committee, like the Dies Committee before it, is not guarding democratic Americanism; it is promoting the worst, most Fascist forms of reaction in this country. It is seeking to develop an anti-red hysteria, under cover of which the great banks and monopolies can the more easily forward their schemes of reaction in the United States, and of imperialist aggression abroad. It begins by attacking the Communists and will end by assailing the trade unions and everything progressive. That is why it has the enthusiastic support of Hearst and all other native Fascists and reactionaries.

This committee is carrying on a combination of Hitlerism red baiting, Japanese "dangerous thought" control, and Salem witch hunting. It is an incipient Gestapo and it should be abolished.

(Whereupon, at 11:15 o'clock a. m., the committee adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m., Thursday, October 18, 1945.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *Thursday, October 18, 1945.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. John E. Ranking presiding.

Mr. RANKIN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will call Mr. Foster.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM Z. FOSTER (Resumed)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Foster, when we adjourned yesterday we were discussing this pamphlet entitled "Syndicalism." You said you wrote it when?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it was in 1912.

Mr. RANKIN. Wasn't it republished in 1932?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. And circulated in 1932?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir; not by me.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to submit a copy of this publication for the record. I want to quote from it later.

Now, Mr. Foster, in 1930 you testified before the investigating committee of the House on Communist propaganda here in Washington, did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. I testified before the Fish committee. I don't know what year it was.

Mr. RANKIN. This book entitled "Syndicalism" advocates revolution, does it not?

Mr. FOSTER. Obviously.

Mr. RANKIN. It advocates stirring up that revolution through strikes and sabotage, does it not?

Mr. FOSTER. Obviously.

Mr. RANKIN. In 1930, when you appeared before the Fish committee, Mr. Bachman, I believe of West Virginia, was on the committee, and he asked you a question about statements that you had made before, and I am going to read it to you now and ask you if this is your view at the present time. He says:

"You made this statement: 'No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present government. When a Communist heads the government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—the government will not be a capitalist government but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.'"

You made that statement, did you?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so.

Mr. RANKIN. That was your view?

Mr. FOSTER. I made that statement, yes.

Mr. RANKIN. You made that statement. Now again——

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Will the Chairman yield a moment? The understanding last night was that I was to start the questioning. Some of the questions that the Chairman is about to ask, I think are questions that I was going to ask.

Mr. RANKIN. I will only take a short time. I have got one or two questions that I want to bring this down to date, to show the connection between the philosophy expressed in 1930 and that expressed in that revolutionary document that I have just submitted.

You also stated in the same testimony in 1930—the Chairman asked: "Does the Communist Party advocate the confiscation of all private property?" You said: "The Communist Party advocates the overthrow of the capitalist system and confiscation of the social necessities of life, that is, the basic industries and other industries for producing the means of livelihood for the people, the property of the individual, personal belongings and so on, that is, in the sense of their personal property."

Is that still your view?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. RANKIN. You have changed since 1930?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right. I have changed with the changing world, of course.

Mr. RANKIN. But up to that time you had not changed from your attitude expressed in that revolutionary document called "Syndicalism"? That is correct, isn't it?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not correct.

Mr. RANKIN. So you changed twice?

Mr. FOSTER. I hope so.

Mr. RANKIN (continuing).

"The CHAIRMAN. To be a member of the Communist Party do you have to be an atheist?"

To which you, Mr. Foster, answered: "There is no formal requirement to this effect. Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious scruples or religious ideas, but a worker who will join the Communist Party, who understands the elementary principles of the Communist Party, must necessarily be in the process of liquidating his religious belief, and if he still has any lingerings when he joins the party, he will soon get rid of them."

You made that statement, I believe, at that time. Is that your view today?

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to state that it is none of the concern of this committee what my religious or nonreligious beliefs are, none whatever.

Mr. RANKIN. You made that statement, did you, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not answering any questions that have to do with my religious or nonreligious belief. I wish to state that your purpose in asking such questions is to stir up religious dissension in the country.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, will you answer my question?

Mr. FOSTER. I am answering your question.

Mr. RANKIN. Answer my question whether or not you made that statement under oath in 1930.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't have to answer that. It is in the book.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; then I will read you some more.

Mr. THOMAS. I am going to insist on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. My point of order is that it was understood last night that I was to start the questioning today.

Mr. RANKIN. I have got just two more questions here that I want to bring out.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to state in that connection that the Communist Party lays down no requirements regarding the religious convictions of its members. We consistently fight against every form of racial or religious prejudice, and work loyally with people of every religious conviction, and I am not coming here to be quizzed on religion, and will positively refuse to answer any question whatsoever dealing with my religious convictions.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Foster, I am merely asking you if you made that statement under oath. You can be your own judge about what your views are on the subject at this time. I am going to ask one more question, Mr. Thomas, and then you may have the witness.

Mr. Foster, you were asked the question:

"Do you know whether the Communists of this country advocate world revolution?"

Your answer was "yes." Is that your answer today?

Mr. FOSTER. My answer is that Communists all over the world stand for socialism, and furthermore, the statement to that effect is justified by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Schneiderman case, that it is perfectly legal and perfectly correct to advocate, if you wish, world socialism.

Mr. RANKIN. And world revolution?

Mr. FOSTER. World socialism. Let me say, you use this word "revolution." Let's see what we mean by "revolution." Revolution means a change from one social system to another. The capitalist system that we live under was established by a whole series of revolutions, but—

Mr. RANKIN. (interposing). Wait a minute. Just answer the question.

Mr. FOSTER. Never mind, Mr. Chairman, I am answering the question, and you can't shut me up.

Mr. RANKIN. You will obey the rules of the committee while you are in here.

Mr. FOSTER. I am an American citizen, and you cannot put words in my mouth. When you speak of "revolution" you must permit me to state what my conception of revolution is. You may handle people in the Southwest that way, but you can't handle me that way.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Foster, you stated in answer to a question—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing): I am defining revolution. You said do I believe in revolution, and I am telling you what I believe in. The capitalist system was established by a whole series of revolutions in England, in France, in China, in many other countries, and in the United States we had two revolutions establishing the capitalist system under which we live, and naturally the establishment of socialism will be a revolution. Whether it is peaceful or violent will depend upon the circumstances. As far as the capitalist revolutions were concerned, they were all very violent.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Foster, since you have answered—made your answer, which confirms your adherence to the attitude, it seems to me, that you expressed 32 years ago, I am asking Mr. Thomas to proceed with the examination.

Mr. FOSTER. I did nothing of the kind. I did nothing of the kind, and you will not put words into my mouth. I specifically repudiated this book, and you can't make me say anything else.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Foster, my questions are going to be very short, and I think you can answer them very briefly.

Mr. FOSTER. I will be very glad to.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it will be much easier if we do it that way.

The first question is, did you ever state that no big strike takes place now in the United States without the Communists taking a decisive part?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know what year that refers to.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, to refresh your memory, I believe you did state that before the committee on Un-American Activities when you were before that committee last.

Mr. FOSTER. That was what year, please?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, whenever you were before the committee. For instance, on pages 5400 it gives your 1928 acceptance speech, and in that speech you say: "No big strike takes place now in the United States without the Communists taking a decisive part." Do you recall making that statement in 1928, in your acceptance speech?

Mr. FOSTER. It was probably true at the time.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you believe now that no big strike takes place in the United States without the Communists taking a decisive part?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Are the Communists taking any part in the present strikes that are so abundant throughout the Nation?

Mr. FOSTER. The Communists work in all the industries of the country, and like other workers they take part in such strikes as develop.

Mr. THOMAS. So that they are taking quite a part at the present time?

Mr. FOSTER. I guess they are, like all other workers, of course.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you conferred with other Communist leaders in connection with any Communist activities in relation to the current strikes?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. You have not conferred with any Communist leaders or labor leaders?

Mr. FOSTER. Only like every other citizen does. This is a matter of common interest.

Mr. THOMAS. Who are some of the strike leaders that you have conferred with in connection with the present strikes?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not conferred with any strike leaders in connection with the present strikes.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you conferred with Micheal Quill?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you conferred with Joe Curran?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you conferred with Harry Bridges?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Are you sure you have not conferred with Harry Bridges?

Mr. FOSTER. Positively.

Mr. THOMAS. And you have conferred with no other labor leaders in connection with the strikes?

Mr. FOSTER. No; only insofar as they may be members of our national board. We have some labor leader members of our national board.

Mr. THOMAS. Who are some of the labor leaders who are members of the national board that you have conferred with in connection with the strikes?

Mr. FOSTER. Their names are published.

Mr. THOMAS. Who are they, Mr. Foster? It will be much easier for you to tell us.

Mr. FOSTER. We have on our national board Mr. Weinstock and Mr. Potash. They are members of our national board.

Mr. THOMAS. And what are their labor connections?

Mr. FOSTER. One is head of the painters union in New York and the other is head of one of the workers unions in the fur industry.

Mr. THOMAS. Anyone else?

Mr. FOSTER. None.

Mr. THOMAS. What part are the Communists taking in the longshoremen's strike in New York?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if there are any Communists working on the waterfront, I dare say they are on strike. I hope they are.

Mr. THOMAS. Are they taking an active part in the strike as leaders?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. But you do hope that they are taking an active part?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the leaders of the strike are not Communists.

Mr. THOMAS. How about the strike out in Hollywood? What part are they taking out there?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know about Hollywood. I am not intimately connected with the situation, but from what I read in the newspapers they are not Communists leading that strike, they are A. F. of L. leaders.

Mr. THOMAS. To refresh your memory, in many of these pamphlets—I am going to list them in the record later—you hope to openly and actively state that the Communists should take a leading part in strikes. In many statements that you and other leading Communists have made over a period of time, you openly advocate that the Communists should take a leading part in the strikes. That is true, isn't it? We will agree to that?

Mr. FOSTER. Communists, of course, participate in strikes and do whatever they can to win them.

Mr. THOMAS. Has the Communist Party slipped to the extent that they are not taking the same kind of a leading part today that they used to be taking?

Mr. FOSTER. The present strikes that we now have in the country are spontaneous strikes against the intolerable conditions that the workers face, and it so happens that these strikes are A. F. of L. and C. I. O. strikes in which Communists do not play any outstanding leadership. It may say as to these strikes, however, that we are doing whatever we can to make them win, because their demands are justified, and I wish to say that unless the United States Government and the employers of this country grant the 30 percent wage increase which is generally being demanded by all the workers of the United States, we are heading for a first-class economic disaster. These strikers are striking not merely in the interest of themselves; they are striking in the interest of the entire American people.

Mr. THOMAS. Now let us be as brief as we can, because we have got some distance to go and we want to be fair to you and to the other members of the committee. You don't want this committee to get the impression that the Communist Party in connection with the labor movement is losing ground, do you? The Communist Party today is just as active in the labor movement and in the proportion of strikes as it ever was, if not more so, is it not?

Mr. FOSTER. The Communist Party does not promote strikes. The Communist Party extends the interests of the workers.

Mr. THOMAS. Who promotes the strikes?

Mr. FOSTER. The employers promote strikes.

Mr. THOMAS. The employers promote strikes?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course.

Mr. THOMAS. The heads of the unions do not have anything to do with it?

Mr. FOSTER. Employers and the Government are sharing a large portion of the responsibility.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you mean to say that the heads of the—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). You asked me a question. May I answer it?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; but don't go into a long speech, or we will never get through, Mr. Foster. You might as well understand that.

Mr. FOSTER. These are big questions.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; we certainly have got a lot of big questions here.

Mr. FOSTER. I say that the demands of the workers are justified, and if the employers will not grant them, if they force the workers out on strike—and the main responsibility rests not with the trade unions but with the employers—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). All right. Do labor leaders such as Harry Bridges and Joe Curran and Michael Quill promote any strikes?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course not. They assume a very responsible attitude toward strikes. It is no small matter when workers quit their jobs.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you agree that these strikes today greatly retard reconversion?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you agree that the longshoremen's strike retards the conversion—retards the return of war veterans to this country?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that the strikes—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). You can answer that "yes" or "no."

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a simple question.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you agree that the longshoremen's strike retards the return of war veterans to this country?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to see every strike—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). No; answer "yes" or "no." Do you agree that it does?

Mr. FOSTER. Every strife interferes with production, every strike.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you agree that—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). I agree that every strike interferes with production.

Mr. THOMAS. This hasn't anything to do with production. This has to do with the return of war veterans to the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not answering your trick questions.

Mr. THOMAS. That is no trick question.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; it is.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a very simple question.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. THOMAS. You claim that is a trick question and you refuse to answer it?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't refuse to answer. I say that all strikes interfere with production, and the longshoremen's strike in New York included, and the longshoremen's strike should be settled at the earliest possible moment, so as to facilitate the return.

Mr. THOMAS. I am referring now to veterans, the return of veterans.

Mr. FOSTER. I answered your question that the strike should be settled as quickly as possible, to facilitate the business of the New York Port as quickly as possible.

Mr. THOMAS. And the return of the veterans?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, there is nobody that wants the veterans returned more quickly than organized labor, and I am a little bit doubtful whether somebody else wants them returned so quickly. I think I have read a lot of criticisms of the War Department for not hurrying up their return.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you agree that the wave of strikes will endanger the future progress of the whole labor movement in the United States? You can answer that "yes" or "no."

Mr. FOSTER. What was the question?

Mr. THOMAS. Do you agree that the wave of strikes will endanger the future progress of the whole labor movement in the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. No. The wave of strikes is something that might have been expected after the war as part of the reconversion problem, and anybody who understands the industrial situation could so expect. If the employers of the country, if the Government will—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Now, let us be short. I have got a long way to go here and I want to be fair to you and fair to these other members of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Make it as short as you want, but you are trying to get my opinion, not yours.

Mr. THOMAS. I think we have got to have short answers, though.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is my opinion that is desired here, not yours.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. Did you ever remark that the Communists will never surrender the control of 3 million organized workers to the reactionary leadership of the A. F. of L.?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you mean by that that the Communists controlled 3 million organized workers?

Mr. FOSTER. No. I meant that the Communists fight against any form of racketeering or corruption in the American Federation of Labor, and one of the most outstanding forms of it you see exhibited right in New York at the present

time, where you have a man who has got himself elected for life as president of his union.

Mr. THOMAS. You mean Ryan?

Mr. FOSTER. Ryan. I think if you want—if you are summoning anti-American elements, why don't you summon Mr. Ryan down here and put him on the spot?

Mr. THOMAS. Here is another statement: if the Communists ever head the Government of the United States—and I understand from your previous testimony that you said it was likely—would that government be a Soviet government?

Mr. FOSTER. It would be a Socialist government.

Mr. THOMAS. But you did say it would be a Soviet government, didn't you?

Mr. FOSTER. That is another way of saying Socialist. It might or might not be a Soviet government.

Mr. THOMAS. If it was a Soviet government, would it be a dictatorship of the proletariat?

Mr. FOSTER. In the prospective socialism we have a perspective where many classes will enter into a Socialist government.

Mr. THOMAS. But, Mr. Foster, you said it would be a dictatorship of the proletariat, didn't you?

Mr. FOSTER. The proletariat is the leading force.

Mr. THOMAS. But you said that?

Mr. FOSTER. That is an expression meaning a farmer-worker government.

Mr. THOMAS. I think we know what it means, but didn't you say it?

Mr. FOSTER. I am telling you what it means. If I said it, it is there, but the meaning of translated into our terms is a labor and farmer government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Thomas, would it bother you to ask him a question about the things that I went over?

Mr. THOMAS. Just a minute, and I will be through.

And in that same speech—and I believe that was a speech in 1928, when you were running for President of the United States—didn't you state that behind that dictatorship would stand the Red Army?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose I did.

Mr. THOMAS. And before another congressional committee didn't you state that the Russian people, as you had been able to understand the situation on a number of visits over there, had established fundamental liberties that we have not got in the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is very obvious. I think that Mr. Rankin should be very well aware of that.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you talked to any of these Members of Congress—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). You asked me a question. I would like to answer.

Mr. THOMAS. I asked you if you didn't make that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to answer that question. One of the fundamental liberties they have there is the recognition of equality of all races and nationalities, and that is something we haven't got in the United States. In the South where Mr. Rankin comes from—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Never mind that. I think your answers ought to be more responsive to the questions.

Mr. FOSTER. You asked me a question and I want to answer it, that the Jim Crow system in the South is a scandal.

Mr. THOMAS. The answer is not responsive to the question.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; it is responsive.

The CHAIRMAN. He asked you if you said what he asked you if you said.

Mr. FOSTER. I did.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, I ask you what those liberties are? In the first place, did the Bolsheviki have the same freedom of assembly as we have?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Do the Russian Bolsheviki have the same right of petition that we in America have?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know what that has got to do with un-American activities.

Mr. THOMAS. It is the result of the statement you made yourself, and I just want to find out what you meant by "liberty." Do they have the same freedom of petition that we Americans have?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Do the Russian Bolsheviki have the same freedom of travel that we Americans have?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, under the conditions as I understand they exist there, they have practically been living under war conditions for a number of years.

Mr. THOMAS. And they do not have the same freedom of travel?

Mr. FOSTER. They have an amount of control of traffic. We haven't got free travel conditions here either.

Mr. THOMAS. Do the Bolsheviki have the same freedom of religion that we Americans have?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Do the Bolsheviki have the same freedom of the press that we Americans have?

Mr. FOSTER. I think even more so.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you talked to any of these Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, who have recently returned from Russia?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I have not.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you discussed with them what they found over there?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I have not.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it should appear in the record, and I think you would be interested in this, that almost universally both Democrats and Republicans who have returned have come back with a very gloomy picture of conditions in Russia.

Mr. FOSTER. What business is that of this committee? Is that this business?

Mr. THOMAS. It is this business. You are the leading Communist in the United States. Here are all your pamphlets, and in every one of those pamphlets, practically, you are praising Russia and hardly ever are you praising the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. What has that got to do with un-American activities? Is that illegal to speak favorably of other countries?

Mr. THOMAS. No; we will get to some of the un-American things right down here.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to protest against this line of questioning. In my opinion it is feeding the warmongering sentiment in the country at the present time.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us see if you protest to this question. When you appeared before the Fish-Dickstein Committee you stated that the more advanced workers in America looked upon the Soviet Union as their country, did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know whether I said it or not.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, do you want me to show it to you?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I would like to see it.

Mr. THOMAS. On page 5390 of the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the chairman of which was Mr. Dies, there was a quotation introduced, a dialogue, from the Fish-Dickstein committee hearings. The chairman of that committee asked Mr. Foster:

"Now, if I understand you, the workers in this country look today upon the Soviet Union as their country. Is that right?"

"Mr. FOSTER. The more advanced workers do.

"The CHAIRMAN. Look upon the Soviet Union as their country?"

"Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir."

Do you recall that, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. In the sense that it is a Socialist system, in the sense that the more advanced workers stand for a Socialist system.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you believe that same thing to be true today in the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. In the sense that I explain it now. It is one of those "yes" or "no" answers that you are insisting upon, that should have been explained.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you believe it to be true in the United States today?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that the workers of the world, the more advanced workers of the world, are looking forward to the Socialist system. As far as their respective countries are concerned, of course, the country that they live in is their country, and they defend that country, and we have defended the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. The question refers to the Soviet Union.

Mr. FOSTER. I explained it to you—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). You said "yes"?

Mr. FOSTER. In the sense that it is a Socialist system, that it represents the Socialist system that advanced workers are looking for. This is what you get when you get your yes-or-no answers with no chance to explain.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us go a little further. You likewise stated that they looked upon the Soviet flag as their flag. That is right in this same testimony here. Do you believe that to be true today?

Mr. FOSTER. We have heard a lot of nonsense about this flag business, and I think it is about time that we should be done with it. The American Communists accept the American flag as the flag of this country, and thousands of them have gone out and defended it and have died under it, and many have won distinguished service crosses, and so on. As far as this Red flag is concerned, it has always been the flag of the international labor movement, the international Communist movement, the international Socialist movement, the international trade-union movement. Maybe you may not know, but the British Labor Party sang the Red Flag in Parliament. It is the symbol of the international labor movement.

Mr. THOMAS. In your system we would have two flags, the Red flag and the Star-Spangled Banner?

Mr. FOSTER. Not under my system. I will tell you that for a hundred years.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Communists got control of the country and there was a Communist government, we will say, would we have both the Red flag and the Star-Spangled Banner?

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated that the workers of the world for 100 years have had the Red flag as their international symbol. Not only that, but the American Revolution had the Red flag, and the town in which I was born was the first town in which the Red flag was raised by the American patriots. So I think there is a lot of nonsense about the Red flag, and it is about time that serious committees of the Government be done with such stuff.

Mr. THOMAS. I am just wondering if the thoughts that you expressed before the old Fish-Dickstein committee are the same as your thoughts on the subject today?

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated my thoughts now.

Mr. THOMAS. They are just the same today as then?

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated my thoughts very clearly at the moment.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you write a book entitled "Towards Soviet America"?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. When?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that was about 1932.

Mr. THOMAS. In this book did you not write that the American Soviet Government would join with other Soviet Governments in the world Soviet Union?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, we are internationalists.

Mr. THOMAS. That is not an answer.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to be putting in these yes-or-no answers.

Mr. RANKIN. The question is did you write that in that book?

Mr. THOMAS. Did you write it in the book?

Mr. FOSTER. You asked me the question whether I stood for a world Socialist government.

Mr. THOMAS. No, I didn't say that. I asked you if you wrote it in the book.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you ask me? It is in the book. If you want my opinion on it, I will tell you my opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, supposing that does take place——

Mr. FOSTER. (interposing). You don't want my opinion?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I want your opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. You don't want my opinion. You want me——

The CHAIRMAN. Don't argue, Mr. Foster, and we will get along a lot faster. You have the privilege of explaining your answers.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't believe I have any privileges.

Mr. THOMAS. You have a lot of privileges.

Mr. FOSTER. But I want my privilege right now when the question is being asked. You don't want my opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you not think that Russia will dominate that union?

Mr. FOSTER. You are trying to get some phoney answers out of me that you can use for red baiting throughout the country.

Mr. THOMAS. No, I am not.

Mr. FOSTER. And you are not going to get them. I demand the right to answer that question now.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, you have answered it, Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. Indeed I have. You have asked me if it is in the book. You don't have to ask me that. It is in the book.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you have answered the question, now I am——

Mr. FOSTER. (interposing). Why don't you let me explain my position on that?

Mr. THOMAS. Here is another little question.

Mr. FOSTER. You don't dare do it. You just want to create a red hysteria in the country behind which——

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). That has already taken place.

Mr. FOSTER (resuming). Behind which reaction can carry on its program of imperialism.

Mr. THOMAS. Imperialism has already taken place throughout the world.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is a disgrace that the Congress permits such a committee as this to exist, to carry on such ridiculous red baiting. There is not another country in the world that would permit such a committee as this to exist.

Mr. THOMAS. That will look fine in the Communist Daily Worker tomorrow, but we have read it in today's paper.

Mr. FOSTER. And I want to say something else. You are not going to get away with this red baiting campaign. Hitler didn't succeed with his. Dies didn't succeed with his. Dewey didn't succeed with his in the last election campaign.

Mr. RANKIN. And Rankin is not succeeding?

Mr. FOSTER. And Rankin is not going to succeed in his. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. Now let me ask you this, getting back to that question—

Mr. FOSTER. (interposing). And I want to say furthermore that when the poor whites and the Negroes of the South acquire the right to vote, you won't see any more Rankins and Bilbos disgracing the American Congress. We will be done with such nonsense as this committee.

Mr. RANKIN. You left out Mr. Truman and Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. THOMAS. I have one other question I would like to ask. Getting back to that book of yours—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). Why don't you talk about something nowadays instead of 20 years ago?

Mr. THOMAS. I am going to talk a lot more about nowadays. If this turned out to be the case, don't you think that Russia would dominate that Soviet Union?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. By that you mean that you haven't got any opinion about it?

Mr. FOSTER. Of something 20 years ago.

Mr. THOMAS. No, now. I say now.

The CHAIRMAN. Or in the future?

Mr. FOSTER. Today we have a world organization of which the Soviet Union is a part, and the United States Government is trying to dominate that organization, and I want to say that in my opinion Mr. Byrnes split the London Conference, not only split it but he split it deliberately.

Mr. THOMAS. Then we won't have any Soviet Union, but are going to have this other union that we have set up?

Mr. FOSTER. We have the United Nations, and the Communist Party supported that.

Mr. THOMAS. So we won't have any Soviet Union?

Mr. FOSTER. That is your idea.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, are we going to have one or aren't we going to have one? I am trying to get the information from you.

Mr. FOSTER. Are we going to have the Socialist world?

Mr. THOMAS. No, are we going to have a Soviet Union of the world, which you referred to in your book?

Mr. FOSTER. We are going to unless I am very much mistaken. We are going to have a Socialist world, of course, and no doubt it will be organized internationally.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that answers the question, except the last part of it. In the last question that was asked you, in the event that takes place, will the Soviet Union, Russia, control and dominate it?

Mr. FOSTER. In the Socialist world I don't see why. Of course not. Why should it?

Mr. THOMAS. Is it your opinion that Russia is already advancing along these lines in many parts of the world, in the Balkans, Greece, and those countries?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, in this same book of yours, Towards Soviet America, did you not write that all the capitalist democracies, the United States included, are only the dictatorships of the bourgeois, masked with hypocritical democratic pretenses?

Mr. FOSTER. You want me to answer yes or no?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, did you write it?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if you ask me such a question you must want my opinion. You don't have to ask me if I wrote it, if it is in my book, it is in my book. If you want my opinion now, I will tell it to you, but you don't want my opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I want your opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. You are very careful not to get my opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. No, I am going to let you answer the next question and give your opinion in great detail. Then you say that neither a Fascist state nor a Communist state can exist in a democratic capitalist state.

Mr. FOSTER. It depends on what kind of capitalist state it is. The United States is not a Fascist state. Germany is not a capitalist state—or is a capitalist state—it was a Fascist state, but fortunately we put that out of business.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you say that neither a Communist state nor a democratic state could be Fascist.

Mr. FOSTER. But we have strong Fascist elements in the capital state, and I want to say that in the last election Mr. Dewey for the first time in the history of the United States, in his campaign, raised a real Fascist danger in this country.

Mr. RANKIN. In what way?

Mr. FOSTER. In the whole line that he followed, the whole line of policy. Behind him stood every Fascist and reactionary in the country except the poll taxers of the South who—

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). That clears me and Jim Byrnes.

Mr. FOSTER (continuing). Who did not formally support him, but no doubt would have been very happy to see him win.

Mr. THOMAS. Could a Communist state be a Fascist state?

Mr. FOSTER. No, of course not.

Mr. THOMAS. Is the United States still a dictatorship of the bourgeois?

Mr. FOSTER. All capitalist countries are ruled by bourgeois, which is a technical term—dictatorship means the rule of the bourgeois. Of course, that does not mean to say that the workers have not certain very definite rights in the country, the right of organization, the right of free speech, and many other very important rights which they are willing to go out and fight and die for.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, this next question is sort of dragging over the coals a little bit, but I think we might get an answer to it again for the record. Did you not at one time call World War II an imperialistic war?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right. It was, too.

Mr. THOMAS. Was that before or after Russia signed the nonaggression pact with Germany?

Mr. FOSTER. If I am to characterize the war I have to be given an opportunity to characterize it. It is not something that can be stated yes or no.

Mr. THOMAS. You don't want to answer whether it was after or before?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I want to answer.

Mr. THOMAS. Was it before or after Germany signed the nonaggression pact with Russia?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to answer yes or no on such questions. I demand the right, if I am asked such a question, to state my analysis of what this war was all about. The war in its conclusion was a people's war, of course, and in the beginning it was an imperialist war.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you at one time consider the Japanese-Chinese war an imperialistic war?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Was America's war against Japan an imperialistic war?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. What was your reason for the break with Earl Browder?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know what you mean, "break." Browder is a member of our party.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Browder held a very high position in the party, and then, as a result of something that must have happened, the Communist Party decided to take that high position away from Mr. Browder. I understand you now have the position that he had.

Mr. FOSTER. Not true.

Mr. THOMAS. You mean you don't have the same position he had then?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Then there was no break between you and Mr. Browder?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Browder is a member of the party. So am I. I don't know what you mean by "break."

Mr. THOMAS. What high position did he hold in the party?

Mr. FOSTER. He was general secretary, and I am national chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, is Mr. Browder still general secretary?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Why isn't he general secretary now?

Mr. FOSTER. Because he was not elected.

Mr. THOMAS. Why wasn't he elected?

Mr. FOSTER. You will have to ask our convention that. They elected him.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you mean I will have to go before the whole convention and ask them in the meeting why they didn't elect him? You must know.

Mr. FOSTER. We have a pretty elaborate report of our convention.

Mr. THOMAS. What is your opinion as to why Mr. Browder was not elected?

Mr. FOSTER. Because the convention did not agree with his policy.

Mr. THOMAS. What proposals did he make that they did not agree with?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, that is a very extensive proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, can't you answer that in a few sentences? You usually want to give general answers to these things, and long answers. Now here is your opportunity, here is your chance.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Browder made certain interpretations of the agreement at Teheran that our party did not agree with.

Mr. RANKIN. What were they?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that this is not a question of Browder. This was a question of a certain interpretation that was made by many in our party. For one thing, Mr. Browder seems to be of the opinion that the great trusts and monopolies of the United States had learned the lesson of this war and the last war, and had come to realize that they must work in a fraternal spirit with the other governments of the world, that is, on a democratic give and take position, but the convention didn't agree with him. The great monopolies and reactionary interests in the United States have not such an opinion, but instead have the determination to make their influence predominant throughout the world; in other words, to dictate one form or another to the rest of the countries of the world, and experience goes to prove that this is so. This feeling on the part of these reactionary forces, which I characterized in my remarks yesterday—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). That is a strong indictment against Mr. Browder.

Mr. FOSTER. These reactionary forces whom I characterized in my remarks yesterday, undoubtedly think that America at this moment is called upon to lead the world without regard to the democratic aspirations of other countries.

Mr. THOMAS. You fully realize that the last part of your remarks is an indictment of Mr. Browder?

Mr. FOSTER. I am speaking here—you can draw such conclusions as you please—I am saying that our newspapers are full at the present time of statements to the effect that the United States is leading the world, that the United States is called upon to lead the world, that the United States must lead the world, and so on. These people see that the United States is the strongest country in the world, that it has the greatest industrial system; our production is perhaps 50 percent of the total production of the world; we have some three-fourths of the gold reserve of the world; we have a Navy bigger than all the navies of the world put together; we have an air force—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). A pretty good place we are living in. I wish you had said some of that in some of these pamphlets.

Mr. FOSTER. I said better than that.

Mr. THOMAS. I didn't find it.

Mr. FOSTER. The United States has a very powerful Army, probably the best equipped Army in the world. It has the biggest air force in the world, and these reactionary forces see all these things, and they are proposing to cash in on them by telling the rest of the world what to do.

Mr. THOMAS. Isn't it true that these same reactionary forces brought about all this?

Mr. FOSTER. No, they had nothing whatever to do with it. But I am speaking here—you asked my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. No, he asked what caused your break with Mr. Browder.

Mr. FOSTER. I am stating the opinion of our party on these things.

The CHAIRMAN. By that you mean Mr. Browder did not at that time embrace those views?

Mr. FOSTER. You will have to get Mr. Browder on the stand. You can ask him whether he agrees or not. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. You still assign those reasons as being the reasons, in your opinion, that he was not reelected as the head of the party?

Mr. FOSTER. In general. These reactionary forces are undertaking to utilize this great strength of the United States to dominate the world. Well, we say that this is the road to disaster. The peoples of the world are not going to permit this.

The CHAIRMAN. And as I understand it, speaking for yourself, these reasons you have, or which were embraced in the main by Mr. Browder, were the controlling reasons that you did not support him for reelection?

Mr. FOSTER. For some of them. We stated this was the road to disaster. The peoples of the world are not going to permit American world domination. They want America to cooperate democratically with them, not to dominate them, regardless of its strength. It must restrain itself, in view of its over-weening strength, and treat these countries in a democratic way.

The effect of the policies that these forces are now putting forth, for example, the economic policy, the policy dealing with loans, as outlined by Mr. Hoover in his recent Chicago speech, would, in my opinion, lead to an economic crisis in this country of unprecedented proportions.

Mr. THOMAS. Where does Mr. Browder come in on that?

Mr. FOSTER. You asked me what our opinions were and what the position of our convention was.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I am inquiring from the standpoint of why he was not elected.

Mr. FOSTER. You told me that now I have my chance.

Mr. THOMAS. You have.

Mr. FOSTER. Please live up to your word. Don't back up on your word.

Mr. THOMAS. No, but stick to Mr. Browder.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sticking to the policy of our party.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand he is giving reasons why the party did not continue to have Mr. Browder at its head.

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly.

Mr. THOMAS. And these are all reasons why Browder was deposed?

Mr. FOSTER. I am stating the position of our party. I stated what I considered to be Mr. Browder's opinions at the beginning. I am now stating what our opinions are and what the policies of our party are. Mr. Hoover organized the biggest crisis that this country or the world ever saw, and we say that to follow his economic program, which he is proposing now, will lead to an economic crisis beside which the crisis of 1929 will seem like prosperity. The building of this gigantic military force can have no other effect—the military force that is proposed for the postwar can have no other effect but to overawe the world. Why do we want a Navy twice as big or as big as all the rest of the navies of the world put together? Who are we going to fight, I would like to know?

Why do we hold the atomic bomb secret? The mere holding of that secret is a threat to the rest of the world. And the progressive people understand that. The very men who developed the atomic bomb are the ones who are telling us that we should share that with the rest of the nations of the world.

Mr. THOMAS. Right there—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). I believe I have the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Will you yield there?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I will not yield at all.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, go ahead.

Mr. FOSTER. The atomic bomb—the attempt of the United States to monopolize the atomic bomb will probably turn out to be the greatest political mistake we have ever made in our history.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are getting a little far away from the question, Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. I am explaining here what is the attitude of our party.

The CHAIRMAN. The atomic bomb was not in existence when Mr. Browder was deposed as head of your party.

Mr. FOSTER. But this is part of the imperialist policy upon which we have embarked.

Mr. THOMAS. I think he is doing a good job.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the imperialists of the country who want to retain this atomic bomb. The intelligent thing to do about it, it seems to me, would be to turn this over to the United Nations, with the complete guarantee that protection is developed against the use of the atomic bomb by any country. But this is only one side of the matter. I think our political policy also has an imperialistic trend

in every direction. To come to a conclusion, I say that in speaking against this imperialistic trend that we are now going into, we are speaking in the supreme interest of the American people. This is the way to disaster. The people in the colonial countries will not stand for American domination. Latin America will not stand for American domination. The new democratic governments of Europe will not stand for American domination. The Soviet Union don't like it either. Great Britain will not stand for it, and if the United States is to follow the line that Mr. Byrnes is now developing, apparently with the acquiescence of President Truman, and with the overwhelming pressure of the Republicans and poll taxers in Congress—and I may say this, that this alliance between poll taxers and Americans—

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). And Americans?

Mr. FOSTER. And Republicans—they also are Americans, incidentally—we are all Americans, whatever our beliefs—this alliance between the poll taxers of the South and the Republicans of the North is the most sinister force that exists in America at the present time, and the American people must see to it that this imperialistic trend is checked.

Mr. THOMAS. As I understand it, all this then is the reason why Mr. Browder was deposed as the general secretary?

Mr. FOSTER. He was not deposed; he was not elected.

Mr. THOMAS. All right. Now I want to thank you very much for your deference and the fairness with which you have answered the questions, and I sort of apologize for the rest of the committee for taking up so much time. Just one more thing, and then the Chairman can have the witness.

Mr. RANKIN. I have got one or two questions.

Mr. THOMAS. I have a few more questions, but I am not going to ask any more, because you did a very good job in that last statement.

I have some pamphlets that are supposed to have been written by you, and I would like to have the titles put in the record. I was going to quote from some of them, because some of them are very amusing, particularly, Roosevelt heads for War, by William Z. Foster; The People and the Congress, by William Z. Foster; What's What about the War. Questions and Answers. I suppose you wish you had never written that pamphlet?

Mr. FOSTER. We can discuss that if you want me to.

Mr. THOMAS. And here is another one, The War Crisis, Questions and Answers. However, you wrote all these, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the titles of these pamphlets be placed in the record.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Thomas, suppose you let Mr. Foster go through them and identify them and make sure that they are all his.

Mr. THOMAS. And if you have any other pamphlets that you wrote, give us the names.

Mr. ADAMSON. Tell us if there are any there that you did not write. [Handing the pamphlets to Mr. Foster.]

Mr. THOMAS. Whatever you do, let us not lose those pamphlets, because there are some quotations in there that we will probably have to refer to.

(The list of pamphlets follow:)

Roosevelt Heads for War. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y., February 1940.

The People and the Congress. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York City. February 1943.

What's Wrong about the War. Questions and Answers. Published for the National Election Campaign Committee Communist Party of the United States, by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y., July 1940.

The War Crisis. Questions and Answers. Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y., January 1940.

Organized Methods in the Steel Industry. Workers Library Publishers. New York, 1936.

Little Brothers of the Big Labor Fakers. Published by the Trade Union Unity League, 2 West 15th Street, New York.

Labor and War. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y. January 1942.

Industrial Unionism. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York City. First edition April 1936. Second edition, August 1936.

Halt the Railroad Wage Cut. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y. October 1938.

Speed the Second Front. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D (852 Broadway), New York, N. Y. October 1942.

The Railroad Workers and the War. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York City. May 1941.

What Means a Strike in Steel. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York City, February 1917.

The Railroaders Next Step—Amalgamation. Published by The Trade Union Education League, 118 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Smash Hitler's Spring Offensive Now. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc. Post Office Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway.) New York City, March 1942.

Soviet Democracy and the War. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y., December 1943.

The Soviet Trade Unions and Allied Labor Unity. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y., June 1943.

Organized the Unorganized. Published by the Trade Union Educational League, 156 West Washington Street, Room 37, Chicago, Ill., by William Z. Foster, Earl Browder.

Technocracy and Marxism, Together with The Technical Intelligentsia and Socialist Construction by V. M. Molotov. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York, January 1933.

The Little Red Library. No. 1. Trade Unions in America, by W. Z. Foster, J. P. Cannon, and E. R. Browder. Published for the Trade Union Educational League by the Daily Worker Publishing Co., 1113 West Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

The Trade Unions and the War. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway) New York, N. Y. June 1942.

Unionizing Steel. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York City, August 1936.

The United States and the Soviet Union. Published by Workers Library, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y., December 1940.

The U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R.—War Allies and Friends. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York City, October 1942.

Victorious Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union. Published by Trade Union Unity League, 2 West Fifteenth Street, New York, N. Y.

The Revolutionary Crisis of 1918–1921 in Germany, England, Italy and France. Published by the Trade Union Educational League, 118 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Defend America by Smashing Hitlerism. Published by Workers Library, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y., September 1941.

The Crisis in the Socialist Party. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York City, November 1936.

Company Unions, by Robt. W. Dunn, with conclusions by Wm. Z. Foster, published by The Trade Union Educational League, 156 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

For Speedy Victory—The Second Front Now. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York, N. Y., October 1943.

A Manual of Industrial Unionism. Organizational Structure and Policies. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

Strike Strategy. Published by the Trade Union Educational League, 156 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

The Soviet Union—Friend and Ally of the American People. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York City, October 1941.

Railroad Workers Forward. Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York, October 1937.

Fight Against Hunger. Statement by C. P., U. S. A., and presented to Fish Committee by William Z. Foster, December 5, 1930. Workers Library Publishers, Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York City.

Party Building and Political Leadership, Wm. Z. Foster, Alex Bittelman, James W. Ford, Charles Krumbein. Workers Library Publishers, Post Office Box 148, Station D, New York City.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a little correction in some of my testimony yesterday. I think I said that we dissolved the Communist Political Association and organized the Communist Party. That is not exact. What we did in our convention was to change the name of the Communist Party or of the Communist Political Association and change the constitution, change the leadership, and so on. We did not actually dissolve it. It was the same convention. It was quite a different process and what we did changing from the C. P. to the Communist Political Association. There we formally and completely dissolved the Communist Party by a motion and went through the necessary legal procedure to transfer the property of the Communist Party to the Communist Political Association.

Mr. RANKIN. Then you reorganized in this last convention? You reversed the process? You organized the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. No; we did not.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Foster, you seem to use the term "socialism" and "communism" interchangeably.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MUNDT. Which, to me is a bit confusing. You said Communists all over the world are socialists.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not the same. Sometimes carelessly it may be done, but they are not the same.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you be able, with comparative brevity, to distinguish between what you mean by socialism and communism? I am thinking now of socialism.

Mr. FOSTER. Socialism is the first stage of communism. Socialism is that stage of society in which the guiding principle is from each according to his needs, to each according to his work.

Mr. MUNDT. That is socialism?

Mr. FOSTER. That is socialism. Whereas, communism is from each according to his needs—no, from each according to his ability, and to each according to his needs.

Mr. MUNDT. Are there any other distinctions between the two?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there are others, but that is the basic distinction.

Mr. MUNDT. The substitution of the word "ability" for the word "needs"?

Mr. FOSTER. If you care, I can explain in 2 minutes what that signifies.

Mr. MUNDT. All right.

Mr. FOSTER. There has been much talk in the country that there have been piece-work systems and so on introduced in the Soviet Union, and that this indicates a going back to capitalism. This is not so. A hundred years ago Marx pointed out that under socialism workers receive pay in accordance with their work, which can include a piece-work system if necessary; whereas, under communism the assumption is that production will be so extensive that it will not be necessary to distribute it—at least the necessities of life—on a wage basis, but that there will be more or less of a free distribution according to the needs of the particular individual.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you say that where piece work prevails, communism does not exist?

Mr. FOSTER. Under socialism that is quite a common system, but it is a very different system than that in the United States. There the workers get the benefit of the piece-work system; in the United States, the bosses get the benefits of it. Under socialism the workers are firm advocates of piece work, whereas in—

Mr. MUNDT (interposing). Do you mean communism?

Mr. FOSTER. No. Under socialism, very often, piece work exists and the workers are firm advocates of it because they get the advantage of it; whereas, under capitalism the trade-union movement almost universally opposes piece work, because the employer gets the benefit of it.

Mr. MUNDT. How about under communism?

Mr. FOSTER. No piece work.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you say that where piece work exists, communism does not exist then?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I said no piece work. It is possible in certain circumstances there might be, but the assumption of communism is that the production problem is solved and that there will be such an abundance of production that it will not be necessary to deal out shoes and clothes and other necessities on the basis of the wages.

Mr. MUNDT. By and large then, communism is opposed to piece work?

Mr. FOSTER. Under capitalism; yes.

Mr. MUNDT. How about under communism?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is no question. Under communism that does not occur as a question at all. It is no question under socialism either. All the workers are in favor of the piece work system there.

Mr. MUNDT. Communism, then, is in favor of the piece work system?

Mr. FOSTER. No; socialism.

Mr. MUNDT. Let us leave socialism out. We don't have Mr. Norman Thomas here.

Mr. FOSTER. We haven't got communism either.

Mr. MUNDT. But we are talking about a theoretical condition.

Mr. FOSTER. The Soviet State is not a Communist state; it is a Socialist State, and the assumption is that the productive apparatus would be developed to such a high degree that the question of production is no worry any more.

Mr. MUNDT. Why do you suppose they have the piece-work system in Russia?

Mr. FOSTER. I just stated that that is characteristic of socialism, and particularly it is necessary in a country like Soviet Russia, which is just building up its industries, and where production is the problem. Under capitalism the problem is distribution. We don't know how to distribute what we produce, whereas, under socialism distribution is no problem at all. In Soviet Russia there is no such thing as an economic crisis. There cannot be an economic crisis. The Soviet Union is the only country in the world that is not worrying about unemployment. All the capitalist countries worry about unemployment because the great problem there, once they recover from the first ravages of the war, will be distribution.

Mr. MUNDT. What system would you say prevails in the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. Capitalism.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you say we have democracy?

Mr. FOSTER. We have a certain bourgeois democracy here. For example, we have a freedom of the press in which Mr. Hearst owns newspapers all over the country; the workers own none.

Mr. MUNDT. Does Mr. Hearst own the Daily Worker?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I think you don't have to ask that question.

Mr. MUNDT. Who owns that?

Mr. FOSTER. The Daily Worker is owned by—

Mr. MUNDT (interposing). Owned by the workers, is it not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I thought you said they owned none?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is a small paper and has a small circulation. Mr. Hearst's papers have a circulation of many millions, and there are whole groups of big capitalist papers who dominate the press of the country. We have that kind of a free press, but that is bourgeois press.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no reason why you could not publish ten million copies of the Daily Worker every day if somebody would buy them, is there?

Mr. FOSTER. If you had the necessary capital.

Mr. MUNDT. If you had the necessary purchasers.

Mr. FOSTER. It takes a lot of capital to get out a paper of this character.

Mr. MUNDT. It takes a lot of purchasers too.

Mr. FOSTER. We have certain liberties under the bourgeois system. That is obvious.

Mr. MUNDT. But we can agree that we both feel that the United States has a capitalistic system?

Mr. FOSTER. Right.

Mr. MUNDT. And I believe you said yesterday—and I believe you said in the Daily Worker, in your press statement, and wherever else it was published—that the capitalistic system is decadent?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right. I don't want to go into a long talk, but I think in 2 or 3 minutes I can explain that. During the past generation capitalism has produced two world wars. It has produced fascism, it has produced the most devastating economic crisis in the history of the world. Look at capitalism in Japan. It is wrecked. Capitalism in Germany is wrecked. Capitalism in England is in a very serious condition. Capitalism in France also is very serious. All over Europe the capitalist system is in a very serious predicament. Italy is wrecked. The one exception is the United States, and here we escape the ravages of war and we are living in a dream world about our capitalist system in the United States. Mr. Willkie told us that we live in one world, and we should realize that, particularly with regard to the capitalist system. The capitalist system in the

United States is a full brother to the broken-down capitalist system in Germany, Italy, and the rest of the countries of Europe, and it is going the same way that they are going. For the moment it is strong, but it bears within itself the seeds of the same ruin that has fallen upon capitalism in the rest of the world.

Today we are talking about free enterprise in this country, which is a lot of nonsense. First of all, the country is run by monopolies, and secondly the idea that we can live on a basis of free competition as in the early stages of capitalism is ridiculous. The day has long passed since capitalism in the United States could keep the industries of America in operation. For the past 30 years, in fact, the American capitalist system, for all its strength, has lived very much on the basis of war orders, repairing war damage, and Government subsidies, and the only hope now to avoid a collapse that will shatter the world's economic system is precisely for the Government to adopt some system of full employment such as was proposed by President Truman. That will not save us. President Roosevelt, who was so hated by the big capitalists of the country, outlined in his bill of economic rights certain measures that would lend a certain amount of strength to the capitalist system. Mr. Wallace in his book "Sixty Million Jobs" has concretized that to a certain extent.

Mr. MUNDT. The Communists endorse the position of Mr. Wallace?

Mr. FOSTER. President Truman in his opening speech to Congress outlined a whole series of proposals along this general line, but Congress has seen fit to cut the heart out of the whole business, and Congress is now heading the country towards a first-class economic disaster.

Mr. MUNDT. Do the Communists endorse the position of Mr. Wallace?

Mr. FOSTER. The Communists endorse any proposition that will tend to eliminate unemployment in the country. We think that President Truman should have come out stronger for President Roosevelt's economic bill of rights for full employment, and we disagree with Mr. Wallace on many questions, but insofar as he concretizes President Roosevelt's economic bill of rights, we go along with him.

Mr. MUNDT. You have stated a very gloomy picture of capitalism and pointed to a lot of evil consequences of it. Nobody claims it is a perfect system.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a dying system.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if you would point out any place in the world where the worker is better off than he is under the American capitalistic system. We are living in one world you said, and I agree with you. Can you pick any place in the world now where you can find a better system than ours?

Mr. FOSTER. What has that got to do with it? We have had the advantage of very favorable circumstances here. We found a continent that was empty, except for a handful of Indians. We found a continent that was free of feudalism and free of these old, reactionary traditions which paralyze progress. We found a country that was superlatively rich in natural resources, and capitalism grew and flourished in the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. It never has had any other system, had it, but capitalism?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, at the beginning it was more or less feudalistic, but generally it developed into capitalism, particularly after our Revolution. That was a bourgeois revolution. That was a capitalist revolution.

Mr. MUNDT. The revolution of 1776?

Mr. FOSTER. 1776 and 1861 was especially a capitalist revolution, more a capitalist revolution, in fact, than in 1776. And we have been very favorably situated. We did not suffer the ravages of the First World War. We did not suffer the ravages of the Second World War either. On the contrary, the demands of these wars has enabled us to build our industries to great extent, and this lends a sort of false illusion as to the strength of our American capitalist system. But I want to say again, let us bear in mind what Mr. Willkie said, we live in one world, and American capitalism is just a blood brother of capitalism all over the world, and subject to the same diseases that capitalism elsewhere is, and it is traveling the same path which is historically out.

Mr. MUNDT. You have given a long speech, but you still have not answered my question at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to answer it.

Mr. MUNDT. I would like to have you do so. You and I agree that we live in one world. That is the only world we have got. Can you find any place or any country in all this world where the worker is better off than he is under the capitalistic system of the United States, which we both agree has always existed over here?

Mr. FOSTER. The American standard of living does not require me to say it is the highest in the world. That has been said a million times.

Mr. MUNDT. And developed under the capitalist system.

Mr. FOSTER. As has been said a million times, but that, as I say, is a temporary, illusory situation. Other peoples in the world are building up their standards of living faster than we did. I think that the Russian workers, the Russian people, are building their standards of living far faster than we did, far faster. And not alone that, but they have advantages that we have not. The industries of their country are in the hands of the people; the industries of our country are in the hands of monopolists, and for that we are going to pay very dearly. The Communist Party hopes that we will suffer no diminution in our standards of living. We will do all we can to improve it.

Mr. MUNDT. Then you are unable to point to any other country where the worker is better off than he is today under the American capitalist system?

Mr. FOSTER. You mean economically?

Mr. MUNDT. Economically.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't have to say that. Everybody knows that the American standard of living is higher than that of any other country, for the historical reasons that I pointed out. But that does not say that the peoples in the rest of the world are not building up their standards of living, and not only that, but they are building up on a far healthier political basis than we have got in the United States. I think that is true all over Europe, England, France, and the rest of the countries of Europe, with the exception, perhaps, of the Fascist countries that have been defeated.

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly hope they are building up. They have got a long way to go.

Mr. FOSTER. They are dealing with a wrecked capitalist system and they will have to adopt the nationalization of industries and so forth, which we will get around to shortly.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you say it is a good, wholesome and healthy political and economic system if in any country in the world the workers and the politicians have a different price scale than the majority of the people of the country?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know what you mean by that question.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you say it is a wholesome and healthful condition if in any country in the world a politician could go into a store and buy a dozen eggs for one price, and the worker had to pay twice as much for the same eggs?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is a local situation.

Mr. MUNDT. That is a very definite question.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a local situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question asked was your opinion as to whether or not that sort of situation is good?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is true in every country. That is true here. You men sitting around the table get about 10 times as much as the actual workers in the country.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not talking about income. I am talking about the price system in the stores.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the difference? The question is how much eggs you put on your table, however the mechanism may be organized for putting them there. We have in our country people with incomes of from \$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000. We have the entire industrial system of the country utilized for the benefit of private individuals.

Mr. MUNDT. You still have evaded the question. The question is: Do you consider it wholesome and healthy, economically and politically, for a country to conduct a system whereby in its stores politicians have to pay a certain price and workers pay twice as much for the same merchandise?

Mr. FOSTER. That may or may not be.

Mr. MUNDT. You think it might be all right?

Mr. FOSTER. It may be. If you alluding to the Soviet Union, I told you in the first place that under the system of socialism everybody is not paid alike. The fact of the matter is they have various wage scales according to the productivity of the worker.

Mr. MUNDT. I have not alluded to any wages. I am not talking about income. I am talking about the system whereby you go into a store and make a purchase.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what you have in the United States, so if you consider it a healthy system, personally I do not.

Mr. MUNDT. Well, let us take Hecht's store in Washington—get right down to cases and make it easier for you to answer definitely. Do you think the

Communist Party in the United States should advocate that in Hecht's store a member of Congress should be able to buy a necktie for a dollar, and a working man should pay \$2 for the same necktie?

Mr. FOSTER. The fact of the matter is, that is what you have got now.

Mr. MUNDT. In Hecht's store?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course. You buy things cheaper than anybody else in the country.

Mr. MUNDT. That is news to me. Would you mind conducting a short tour this afternoon to prove that point? I would like to find out.

Mr. FOSTER. Maybe not in every shop.

Mr. MUNDT. I am talking about Hecht's store.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand in your restaurant here you are very much favored by the food prices, and you have other things very favorable. I think this is all very trivial, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the question originally asked you, Mr. Foster, was a pertinent question, whether or not you think that sort of system, if it should prevail in any country, would be a wholesome system, that had the prospects of setting up a better government.

Mr. FOSTER. What has that got to do with un-Americanism? Or what have my ideas got to do with it? I think that this committee—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). By that you mean you prefer not to answer the question?

Mr. FOSTER. If you ask me, I have answered it here for half an hour.

Mr. MUNDT. You have evaded it for half an hour. You haven't answered it yet.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that this series of committees that we have been having, the Fish committee, the Dies committee and this committee, are very much affected with this Japanese idea of controlling thought. What is it your business what I think?

Mr. MUNDT. Do you advocate that?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not advocating anything of the kind. If I am, what about it?

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, you want to evade the question?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not evading any question whatsoever, but such foolish questions that are just designed to make a headline in the press—that is all they are designed for—as “Foster says the standard of living in the United States is higher than anywhere else in the world.” Everybody knows that.

Mr. MUNDT. And you decline to answer the question whether you believe it is a good economic and political system to have a double price schedule?

Mr. FOSTER. If you interpret my replies that way, that is your privilege.

Mr. MUNDT. You don't deny it?

Mr. FOSTER. I do deny it. You have been talking here for half an hour about such nonsense as this, instead of talking about the serious problems before our country. The Communist Party is an active party in the country, and why don't you talk about some of these questions? I would like to talk, for example, about—so long as such trivial matters as this are injected, I would like to talk about something serious, namely, the summoning of the broadcasters, the scripts of these broadcasters. I as an American citizen would like to protest against this.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FOSTER. You don't like to hear that. I would like to protest against that as one of the most outrageous infringements upon American freedom in the last hundred years.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me call your attention to the fact that if you are alluding to any activity of this committee, there has been no such action taken by the committee. This committee has a right to conduct the examination as we choose.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the business of the American citizen, and your committee, after all, is the servant of the American people, not their bosses.

The CHAIRMAN. There have been no scripts subpoenaed by this committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Then why doesn't the committee issue a statement to the press? The whole press of the United States have carried that.

The CHAIRMAN. Quite a few of them are represented here now, and I am making the statement here that no such action has been taken.

Mr. FOSTER. Not only that, but the broadcasters have said so. Not only that, but it has already led to the discharge of at least one broadcaster, and such action by this committee can only be interpreted as an attempt to terrorize the broadcasters of the United States. In fact, I think—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). I think we ought to get to the question here.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this is a very important question.

Mr. THOMAS. I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Foster is out of order.

Mr. MUNDT. It looks as though Mr. Foster don't want to answer the question I asked him, so I will ask him another one. You made some statements here yesterday indicating that General MacArthur—I don't have the transcript of what you said, but you made some statements concerning General MacArthur. What was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the statement that you refer to was a statement I made in a Madison Square Garden Speech to the effect that I think it is a basically wrong policy and imperialistic policy for the United States unilaterally to take unto itself the right to govern Japan as it sees fit, without regard to the nations that fought through the war with us. And I would like to say a word about Japan. It is true our boys fought heroically and beyond heroism in Iwo Jima and Okinawa and elsewhere, and I am sure the entire world thrilled at the wonderful fight that was made in capturing these islands, but we say this: Does this give us the right to just take over Japan and operate it as we please and disregard the rest of our allies? I don't think so. I think it can be said that so far as the loss of life is concerned, the Soviet Union lost more lives over Japan than the United States did. The fact of the matter is the Soviet Union had an army of a million or two in Manchuria holding the Japanese at bay, and if they had been able to use that army in Europe, undoubtedly they would have been able to bring the war to a much more rapid conclusion, and probably saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of Russians.

Mr. MUNDT. Your complaint about MacArthur, then, stems from the fact that he is unilaterally administering Japan?

Mr. FOSTER. That is one thing. I think General MacArthur is a reactionary and—

Mr. MUNDT (interposing). I think he fought a pretty good war.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I am not a military strategist. I listened to and read Admiral Nimitz's speech before Congress, and I know that Admiral Nimitz didn't find it necessary even to mention General MacArthur's name in his entire speech. So I don't know.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you also feel that it is undesirable to have one of our allies unilaterally administering conditions in Roumania and Bulgaria, where Russia unilaterally controls the situation?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't think that happens.

Mr. MUNDT. You know that Russia is administering unilaterally in the Balkans, don't you?

Mr. FOSTER. Not true.

Mr. MUNDT. And you say the United States is administering unilaterally in Japan?

Mr. FOSTER. That is not true.

Mr. MUNDT. What is not true?

Mr. FOSTER. That the Soviet Union is unilaterally administering affairs in the Balkans.

Mr. MUNDT. You say that is not true?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the case.

Mr. MUNDT. In what respect is it not the case?

Mr. FOSTER. Because we have certain control committees there that very definitely have a voice in those situations; in fact, I heard one of the more conservative broadcasters analyzing the situation the other day over the radio, and the way he sized it up was that all the Soviet Union was asking in Japan was precisely what we have in the Balkans, precisely.

Mr. MUNDT. Would that be satisfactory with you, that the Soviet Union would have the same authority in Japan precisely as we have in Roumania and the Balkans?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not worrying about Soviet policy.

Mr. MUNDT. But you are criticizing the general policy of the United States, that the present policy in Japan is not what you want.

Mr. FOSTER. I am making the statement that President Truman as reported in the press has said that what the United States says is going to go in Japan. I say that is a unilateral statement, and a statement that bodes no good for the world.

Mr. MUNDT. It is your position, then, that the United States should have the same position in Roumania and Bulgaria as the Soviet Union should have in Japan?

Mr. FOSTER. The Soviet Union has no position in Japan.

Mr. MUNDT. I am asking you what you think it should be?

Mr. FOSTER. I am willing to leave that to them to work out their own policies.

Mr. MUNDT. You don't want to commit yourself on that? You make very specific proposals about Japan but you are very evasive about the Balkans. Why can't you be consistent?

Mr. FOSTER. What I object to is the United States insisting on control in the Balkans and then carrying on a unilateral policy of dominating Japan entirely alone. That is what they are doing.

Mr. MUNDT. And I am asking you whether you think the same arrangement should be followed in the Balkans as is followed in Japan?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, of course not. Of course not.

Mr. MUNDT. All right. Do you think the same condition should prevail in Japan as prevail in the Balkans?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not well enough acquainted with the exact conditions in the Balkans.

Mr. MUNDT. How does it happen you are such an authority on Japan and know so little about the Balkans?

Mr. FOSTER. Japan is very obvious.

Mr. MUNDT. It is also very obvious that while we have an army in Japan we have no army in the Balkans. All we have is some kibitzers in khaki. Now I wonder whether you think the same conditions should prevail in both places?

Mr. FOSTER. My impression is that the Big Three should get together and work out a joint proposition that will be satisfactory all around in both cases.

Mr. MUNDT. Are you acquainted with Mr. Budenz?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. He was formerly editor of the Capital Daily Worker, or the Daily Worker?

Mr. RANKIN. Not the Capital Daily Worker.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Was he in your opinion a good, loyal communist up to the time he resigned his position?

Mr. FOSTER. He said he was.

Mr. MUNDT. What is your opinion?

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Are we going to meet tomorrow morning?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we will recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. (Whereupon at 11:45 a. m., the committee adjourned until 10 a. m., Friday, October 19, 1945.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *Friday, October 19, 1945.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Are we ready to proceed? I believe Mr. Mundt was asking some questions at the time of adjournment.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM Z. FOSTER (Resumed)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Mundt, you were to ask the witness to give us a definition of the word "bourgeois." How do you spell that word, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. B-o-u-r-g-e-o-i-s. It means capital.

Mr. RANKIN. Bourgeois means capital? What kind of capitalist do you mean? How well off does a man have to be in order to fall in that category?

Mr. FOSTER. When a man reaches the point where he employs workers for wages, he is in the bourgeois.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, it is like being kulak, a man who owns two cows or two horses or hires one man or two men. How many does he have to hire to be in the class of bourgeois?

Mr. FOSTER. Anybody that exploits the laborers, the workers, is a member of the bourgeois.

Mr. RANKIN. You classify employers in the United States generally as the bourgeois?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. That is all I have at the present.

Mr. MUNDT. What year did you say the Communist Party originally dissolved or changed its name to Communist Political Association, or whatever the name is?

Mr. FOSTER. It didn't change its name. It dissolved.

Mr. MUNDT. In 1942?

Mr. FOSTER. Two years ago.

Mr. MUNDT. 1943. And now it has been reconstituted?

Mr. FOSTER. We have reorganized the Communist Party in the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Are there any fundamental differences between the Communist Party as it is presently reorganized, and the Communist Party in the form in which it was dissolved?

Mr. FOSTER. We have a different program. We have a different constitution. We have a different leadership.

Mr. MUNDT. And different objectives?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. Of course, our general objective is characteristic of Communist parties in general.

Mr. MUNDT. What reasons do you feel there are for believing that the un-American allegations which the Attorney General made against the Communist Party in 1942 no longer obtain? I presume you would hold they do not obtain.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I think the Supreme Court of the United States has a few words on that, that perhaps I might read.

Mr. MUNDT. What are you reading from?

Mr. FOSTER. The decision of the Supreme Court in the *Schneiderman case*.

Mr. MUNDT. Who is that published by?

Mr. FOSTER. The American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you are reading from a pamphlet published by the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born? You are not reading from any official document of the Supreme Court?

Mr. FOSTER. I am reading a word for word copy of the decision of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. THOMAS. But not published by the Supreme Court, this matter that you are reading?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, you can have it as you please. It is a word for word copy.

Mr. MUNDT. What date is this decision?

Mr. FOSTER. June 21, 1943.

Mr. RANKIN. What Justice rendered the decision?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Justice Murphy delivered the opinion of the Court.

Mr. MUNDT. Was it a unanimous decision?

Mr. FOSTER. That I don't know. It is a decision of the United States Supreme Court. That is good enough for me.

Mr. MUNDT. I just wondered if it was unanimous.

Mr. FOSTER. That, I understand, is the law of the land.

Mr. MUNDT. You don't know whether it was unanimous or not?

Mr. THOMAS. Do you agree that all decisions of the Supreme Court are the law of the land?

Mr. FOSTER. I am reading this decision. Nobody has agreed with all the decisions of the Supreme Court, I dare say. The attorney for Mr. Schneiderman was Wendel Willkie.

Mr. RANKIN. That ought to satisfy the gentleman from South Dakota. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the gentleman may sneer at Mr. Willkie, but if he was half the American that Mr. Willkie was he would be quite an American.

Mr. RANKIN. I am satisfied that from the Communist standpoint you are right.

Mr. FOSTER. There you have got it exactly, why we oppose this committee. You are undertaking to put Mr. Willkie in the category of communists, and that is exactly why this committee should be dissolved. That is exactly why this committee is a menace to the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). When you undertake to put Mr. Willkie in the category of Communists, a liberal, that exposes the real objective of this com-

mittee, which is to smear every liberal and every progressive in the country as a Communist.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, nobody is trying to smear Mr. Willkie. I was only kidding the gentleman from South Dakota, and he understood it.

Mr. FOSTER. If you wish to apologize go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let us be in order, gentlemen.

Mr. MUNDT. I guess Communists don't have quite the sense of humor that the Republicans and Democrats do.

Mr. FOSTER. The Communists understand politics when they hear it, and this was a typical sneer from Mr. Rankin at everything progressive in the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. I don't think so. I think he was just having a little piece of humor at my expense.

Mr. RANKIN. Whenever you find the Communist program is threatened you criticize real Americans about their attitude.

Mr. MUNDT. Go ahead and read your statement.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not my decision; this is the decision of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. MUNDT. That is right.

Mr. FOSTER. On page 22 of this particular publication——

Mr. ADAMSON (interposing). Do you know the volume and page of the official citation?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I am sorry, I do not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let me see it, please. [Mr. Foster hands the document to Mr. Adamson.]

Mr. CHAIRMAN, they do not give the official citation. The only identification is the following:

"Supreme Court of the United States. October term, 1942. in the case of *William Schneiderman, petitioner*, versus *United States of America*, on a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit."

It is dated June 21, 1943, and is delivered by Mr. Justice Murphy. Apparently it is a majority opinion of the Court, and Mr. Justice Douglas filed a concurring opinion. Mr. Justice Rutledge filed a concurring opinion. The pamphlet omits any reference to any dissenting opinion, and the pamphlet is published, apparently, by the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, New York, 1943, with an introduction by one Carol King. My recollection is that there was a dissent, but I don't see it in this pamphlet.

Mr. FOSTER. Whether there was a dissent or not, this is the law of the land, and I dare say it is quite customary for all, or nearly all, decisions of the Supreme Court to have dissenting opinions.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the excerpts that you have?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to read the following, where the Court deals with the question of socialism.

Mr. RANKIN. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the witness, if he desires to submit that, submit it for the record. We haven't time to listen to anyone read a document.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is an excerpt or two that is short, he may read it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very short.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two excerpts. Mr. Rankin bored us here yesterday by reading half an hour or so from a pamphlet 33 years old. I want to read a decision of the United States Supreme Court that is recent.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, proceed.

Mr. MUNDT. There is nothing stopping you.

Mr. FOSTER. After discussing the presentation by the attorneys on both sides the Supreme Court has the following to say:

"By this decision we certainly do not mean to indicate that we favor such changes——" that is socialism—but I must not interpolate—"our preference and aversions have no bearing here. Our concern is with the extent of the allowable area of thought under the statute. We decide only that it is possible to advocate such changes and still be attached to the Constitution within the meaning of the Government's minimum tests."

If I understand English, that means that it is perfectly——

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). I think we understand the meaning of it, so go ahead and read.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make such remarks as I please.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I will make a few remarks too pretty soon. Go ahead.

Mr. FOSTER. On the question of socialism and the——

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Does it say that there—"on the question of socialism"?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I will tell you when I am quoting the Supreme Court here. You ask me to be brief.

Mr. THOMAS. No; I didn't ask you to be brief.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been asked by this committee to be brief. The Court after reviewing the presentation on both sides as to the establishment of socialism has the following to say:

"A tenable conclusion from the foregoing is that the party in 1927 desired to achieve its purpose by peaceful and democratic means, and as a theoretical matter justifies the use of force and violence only as a method of preventing an attempt at forcible counter overthrow, once the party had obtained control in a peaceful manner, or as a matter of last resort to enforce the majority will, if at some indefinite future time, because of peculiar circumstances, constitutional or peaceful channels were no longer open."

We communists consider that a fair and correct statement of the Communist position, and we stand upon that, and the Court says that that is American, and on the basis of this granted citizenship to a known Communist.

Mr. MUNDT. That is very interesting.

Mr. FOSTER. Not only that, but the United States Government has acted precisely according to that principle, which is also the principle of the Communist Party.

Mr. RANKIN. In what case?

Mr. FOSTER. You will not like the case that I would cite, Mr. Rankin, perhaps, the case of the Civil War. The Civil War was a revolution, and what happened in the Civil War was that the American people by democratic procedure elected a government, whereupon the Southern land owners took up arms against that democratic government and attempted to overthrow it, and the American Government——

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). This hasn't got anything to do with the case before us—just a lot of balderdash.

Mr. FOSTER. The American Government defends itself precisely in accordance with the principles——

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). If we have to listen to a lot of stuff like this all day long we will never get through.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have gone far enough with that.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I object to being shut off here. I was brought down here to find out——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I know, but we are all cognizant of the results of the Civil War. We all know there was a Civil War, and we all know the results.

Mr. FOSTER. I am undertaking to explain the position of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you are going into a history of the Civil War.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going into a history of the Civil War. I am telling you this is the position taken by the American Government in the Civil War, and is precisely the policy of the Communists Party now; therefore, in answer to your question, it is American procedure, and therefore we are strictly within the American tradition in our position.

The CHAIRMAN. We must get along here, Mr. Foster. I will have to ask you to answer the questions that are asked.

Mr. FOSTER. I made a 100 percent responsive answer. If the answer is not pleasant to the committee and doesn't fit in——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). It is not unpleasant to me. I learned about the Civil War in high school.

Mr. FOSTER. I am undertaking to state that the position followed by the American Government in the Civil War is precisely the policy of the Soviets or of the Communist Party.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, as a Southern Democrat I resent classing Abraham Lincoln as a Communist. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOSTER. I didn't class Abraham Lincoln as a Communist, although Abraham Lincoln had intelligence enough to realize that Communists were a progressive force in the world, and he carried on a regular correspondence with Karl Marx.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mundt, have you any further questions of the witness?

Mr. FOSTER. And the Communists of the world supported the Civil War?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, the Civil War happened 84 years ago.

Mr. THOMAS. I don't think we should go into the Civil War, any more than we should go into the war of 1812.

Mr. FOSTER. I know you don't like that because it fits in with the Communist Party policy.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster says 33 years ago is too long, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. FOSTER. I didn't say it was too long. I said I had repudiated that book 25 years ago.

Mr. THOMAS. The Civil War hasn't anything to do with this committee.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you like to restate it?

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to your attorney's question, Mr. Chairman, I not only repudiated that book that Mr. Rankin undertakes to drag in here, I repudiated it officially before a government body here in Washington.

Mr. THOMAS. The witness is a typical Communist in his evasions, and that is what he is trying to do, and he is out of order all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mundt, restate your question.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if you could cite any particulars in which the new Communist party as reorganized differs from the earlier Communist party which was dissolved, which in your opinion would make the new organization less un-American than the old?

Mr. FOSTER. They were both American.

Mr. MUNDT. All right. You say they are both American?

Mr. FOSTER. Both American, the best of Americans.

Mr. MUNDT. You don't know of any changes, then, which in terms of Americanism would make the second organization more palatable than the first?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course not. They are both American parties based on 100 years of tradition of America working in the class struggle.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to read, Mr. Chairman, a short excerpt from a government document entitled "House Document, Volume 16, 77th Congress, Second Session, 1942." This is the report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and I am quoting from the letter of transmittal sent by the Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, who says:

"I am enclosing a copy of the report made to me by the Interdepartmental Committee on Investigation. This committee was established in April 1942, to serve the departments and agencies in an advisory capacity, contribute suggestions as to procedure, and assist in expediting the composition of cases. The members of the committee were John J. Dempsey, Under Secretary of the Interior, Chairman; Edwin D. Dickinson, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, executive secretary; Francis P. Brown, solicitor of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Herbert E. Gaston, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and Wayne C. Taylor, Under Secretary of Commerce.

"Mr. Dempsey participated in the work of the committee until his resignation as Under Secretary of the Interior on June 24, 1942.

"As the report of the Interdepartmental Committee"—whose membership I have just read—"has pointed out at great length, there was ample authority in judicial decisions, administrative rulings and legislative history for classifying the Communist Party and its affiliates and the German-American Bund as subversive organizations within the legislative concept."

Mr. RANKIN. You mean that Attorney General Biddle classified the Communist Party as subversive?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct, in his letter of transmittal to the Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. That was the Communist Party as it existed before it was dissolved in 1943?

Mr. MUNDT. That is right. That was my reason for asking Mr. Foster if there was any difference from the standpoint of fundamental Americanism, and if I understood him correctly he said that in his opinion both parties were American.

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly.

Mr. MUNDT. Continuing over on page 12 of the same report:

"On June 30, 1941, the Attorney General's office advised the Federal Bureau of Investigation that, responsive to the congressional intent as set forth in the aforementioned legislation, the Communist Party was intended to be regarded as a subversive organization within the meaning of the term used.

"It was further stated that organizations having Communist background or Communist affiliations were likewise intended to be included, thereby covering organizations which are popularly known as Communist front organizations."

I just wanted to put that in because it appears that there may be a difference of opinion between that which is illegal and that which is un-American. The Supreme Court apparently in its ruling on the *Schneiderman case*—if that is the proper name of the case—ruled on the legality, because that is all the Supreme Court can do. Attorney General Biddle and the Interdepartmental Committee

also ruled on the Americanism of the organization, and it is entirely conceivable that something can be legal and still be un-American. I think that is the distinction which is to be drawn.

Mr. RANKIN. The decision of the Supreme Court was on the actions of the individual and not on the policy of the Communist Party.

Mr. MUNDT. That is right. It doesn't rule on that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not true. It was on the program of the Communist Party that the Supreme Court ruled, that it was American to advocate what the Communist Party proposed, and at this time, Mr. Chairman, if I may, in reply to the statement of Mr. Mundt, I believe, I would like to say that on the basis of these arguments Mr. Biddle, who was notorious for his red-baiting activities, undertook to smear Harry Bridges, the Communist, with the result that he was reversed by the United States Supreme Court, and I would like to at this time, on the basis of my previous remarks, introduce these two documents. One is the program of the Communist Party, and the other is this document that we quoted from, the Schneiderman case.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

(The documents referred to follow:)

THE PRESENT SITUATION AND THE NEXT TASKS

INTRODUCTION BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

INTRODUCTION

The resolution to which this is an introduction was adopted by the Communist Party at its national convention in New York City, July 23-29, 1945. It is a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the American and world situations in the concluding stages of the great world war and the opening phases of the postwar period. It gives a clear picture of the major economic and political problems confronting harassed humanity and the paths along which the problems must be solved. The surrender of Japan, which took place two weeks after the C. P. convention, has created world repercussions which serve to emphasize the correctness of the analysis and slogans of action of the resolution.

As the C. P. resolution states, the winning of the war against the Axis fascist powers constitutes a tremendous victory "for world democracy, for all mankind." So, too, was the setting up of the United Nations to maintain world peace and to facilitate a friendly economic and political collaboration among the nations of the earth, the latest expressions of which were the decisions of the Potsdam conference. Of world importance to democracy, also, was the development of friendly relations between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. during the war.

These are vital achievements which provide historic possibilities and conditions for realizing the American people's desire for durable peace, flourishing democracy and economic security. These conditions and possibilities exist, both within our country and on a world scale. Their realization, however, depends upon the initiative of the people and the leadership of labor who dare not rest upon the laurels they have won in their great victories. For the forces of reaction and social chaos are still strong and are busily at work internationally, and if they remain unchecked they will plunge the world into an even more terrible disaster than the great world war it is now emerging from. Never were the words more true that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Especially in the United States, organized labor and the masses of the people must be vigilant. For it is in this country, now when the fascist powers have been defeated, that world reaction has its greatest force and finds its most aggressive leadership—in the most fascist-minded sections of finance capital, in our imperialistic big monopolies and trusts.

American reaction is now actively making its evil influence felt, both at home and abroad. Take, for example, the vital matter of reconverting our national economy from a wartime to a peace-time basis. Under the influence of reactionary monopolistic elements a subversive Congress failed completely to prepare the country for the difficult reconversion period. All Congress was interested in was to protect the profits of the employers, after doing which it adjourned for a two months vacation. The millions of war workers were left to face mass unemployment as best they could, without government assistance. The Truman Administration also shares the blame for not pressing its program more actively upon Congress. The result is that the country is threatened with a serious economic crisis. These developments make the adoption of the reconversion

program contained in the C. P. resolution a matter of paramount importance to the entire American people.

American reaction is also trying to defeat the major purposes of the war by seeking to save what it can of the shattered forces of world fascism. In Europe reactionaries of all stripes turn to their political brothers in American big business confidently, and not without results, to shield them from the rising tide of democracy. And in China, reactionary American influence, fostered in large measure by our State Department is creating the danger of a civil war through its machinations with the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek government. This whole situation is one to which the democratic forces, especially organized labor, must pay close attention. For as a nation we are profoundly interested in the strengthening of democracy in Europe and the Far East, as well as in our own hemisphere. The provisions in the C. P. resolution bearing upon this question have won more validity and urgency with each passing day.

The resolution's warnings regarding the necessity for strengthening the United Nations, for consolidating friendly relations between the U. S. S. R. and U. S. A., and for combatting the maneuvers of American imperialism, are being made doubly timely by the present growth of reactionary sentiment in this country among the forces of big capital looking towards American imperialist domination of the world. Seeing the great strength of this country and the weakness of other capitalist lands at the conclusion of the war, the active imperialists are filling our press and radio with propaganda to the effect that the United States, through practically bypassing the United Nations, should virtually take over the leadership of the world. These imperialists hypocritically make it appear that American world rule would have no selfish objectives, but would be carried out in an altruistic spirit of benefiting the peoples everywhere by our leadership. Such imperialist ambitions, however, are the way to new disasters for our nation and the world.

With no little assistance from reactionary figures in our State Department, these imperialists are urging a "tough" attitude towards the U. S. S. R. and the new democratic governments in Europe. They would swing Australia still more definitely under American influence; they would reduce Japan to economic and political dependence upon the United States; they would establish an American economic, and eventually political, hegemony over China; and they would hold as permanent military bases all the Pacific Islands occupied by our armed forces in this war. In short, they would like to turn the Pacific Ocean into an "American lake." These aggressive imperialists would establish American world domination not only through this country's great economic and political strength, but some of them also have the insolence to hint broadly that the United States could use its control of the atomic bomb as infallible means for bending other nations to its will.

These dangerous schemings and developments make it imperative that the labor movement and the great mass of the democratic American people undertake seriously to curb the reactionary imperialists in this country, and to develop their own great irresistible forces for a broad progressive program. To these ends the Communist Party resolution is indispensable. As a program fitted to advance the interests of our nation as a whole, it should be studied far and wide among the workers and the entire American people.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER,
*National Chairman,
Communist Party, U. S. A.*

PRESENT SITUATION AND THE NEXT TASKS

Resolution of the National Convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., Adopted
July 28, 1945

PART I

I

The military defeat of Nazi Germany is a great historic victory for world democracy, for all mankind. This epochal triumph was brought about by the concerted action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition—by the decisive blows of the Red Army, by the American-British offensives, and by the heroic struggle of the resistance movements. This victory opens the way for the complete destruction of fascism in Europe and weakens the forces of reaction and

fascism everywhere. It has already brought forth a new anti-fascist unity of the peoples in Europe marked by the formation in a number of countries of democratic governments representative of the will of the people and by the labor-progressive election victory in Great Britain.

The crushing of Hitler Germany has also created the conditions for the complete defeat and destruction of fascist Japanese imperialism. The winning of complete victory in this just war of national liberation is the first prerequisite for obtaining peace and security in the Far East, for the democratic unification of China as a free and independent nation, and for the attainment of national independence by the peoples of Indonesia, Indo-China, Burma, Korea, Formosa, the Philippines and India. The smashing of fascist-militarist Japan is likewise essential to help guarantee the efforts of the United Nations to build a durable peace.

All these crucial objectives are of vital importance to the national interests of the American people, to the struggle for the complete destruction of fascism everywhere. Now with the defeat of Nazi Germany and the Axis, the possibility of realizing an enduring peace and of making new democratic advances and social progress has been opened up for the peoples by the weakening of reaction and fascism on a world scale and the consequent strengthening of the worldwide democratic forces.

2

However, a sharp and sustained struggle must still be conducted to realize these possibilities. This is so because the economic and social roots of fascism in Europe have not yet been fully destroyed. This is so because the extremely powerful reactionary forces in the United States and England, which are centered in the trusts and cartels, are striving to reconstruct liberated Europe on a reactionary basis. Moreover, this is so because the most aggressive circles of American imperialism are endeavoring to secure for themselves political and economic domination in the world.

The dominant sections of American finance capital supported the war against Nazi Germany, not because of hatred for fascism or a desire to liberate suffering Europe from the heel of Nazi despotism, but because it recognized in Hitler Germany a dangerous imperialist rival determined to rule the world. From the very inception of the struggle against fascism, American finance capital feared the democratic consequences of defeating Hitler Germany.

This explains why the monopolists opposed the concept of collective security in the days when the war still could have been prevented and instead chose the Munich policy which inevitably led to war. Later, even after the anti-Hitler coalition was forged, the forces of big capital who supported the war continued to hesitate and delay, to make vital concessions to the worst enemies of American and world democracy—to the sworn foes of the Soviet Union and to the bosom pals of Hitlerism. That is why American capitalism gave aid to Franco Spain; why it preferred to support the Petains and Darlans and the reactionary governments-in-exile as against the heroic resistance movements of the people. And that is also why it hoped that the Soviet Union would be bled on the battlefields of Europe and why it tried to hold off the opening of the Second Front until the last possible moment.

Only when these policies proved to be bankrupt, meeting growing opposition from the ranks of the people, from the millions of patriotic Americans fighting in our heroic armed forces and working in war production; only when it became obvious that the Soviet Union was emerging from the war stronger and more influential than ever precisely because of its valiant and triumphant all-out war against Nazism, did American capital reluctantly and belatedly move toward the establishment of a concerted military strategy and closer unity among the Big Three.

Now that the war against Hitler Germany has been won, the American economic royalists, like their British Tory counterparts, are alarmed at the strengthened positions of world labor, at the democratic advances in Europe and at the upsurge of the national liberation movements in the colonial and dependent countries. Therefore, they seek to halt the march of democracy, to curb the strength of labor and the people. They want to save the remnants of fascism in Germany and the rest of Europe. They are trying to organize a new *cordon sanitaire* against the Soviet Union, which bore the main brunt of the war against the Nazis, and which is the staunchest champion of national freedom, democracy and world peace.

This growing reactionary opposition to a truly democratic and anti-fascist Europe, in which the people will have the right to choose freely their own forms of

government and social system, has been reflected in many of the recent actions of the State Department. This explains why, at San Francisco, Stettinius and Connally joined hands with Vandenberg—the spokesman for Hoover and the most predatory sections of American finance capital. This explains the seating of fascist Argentina as well as the aid given to the pro-fascist forces of Latin-America; the British-American reluctance to live up to the Yalta accord on Poland; the American delegation's refusal to join with the Soviet Union in pledging the right of national independence for mandated territories and colonies and to give official recognition to the representatives of the World Labor Congress.

These facts reflect the current shift of hitherto win-the-war sections of American capital to closer political collaboration with the most reactionary and aggressively imperialist groupings of monopoly capital.

It is this reactionary position of American big business which explains why powerful circles in Washington and also London are pursuing the dangerous policy of trying to prevent a strong, united and democratic China; why they bolster up the reactionary, incompetent Chiang Kai-shek regime and why they harbor the idea of a compromise peace with the Mikado in the hope of maintaining Japan as a reactionary bulwark in the Far East. It accounts, too, for the renewed campaign of anti-Soviet slander and incitement calculated to undermine American-Soviet friendship and cooperation.

On the home front the big trusts and monopolies are blocking the development of a satisfactory program to meet the human needs of reconversion, of the problems of economic dislocations and severe unemployment, which is beginning to take place and will become more acute after the defeat of Japan. Reactionary forces—especially the NAM and their representatives in government and Congress—are beginning a new open-shop drive to smash the trade unions. They also endeavor to rob the Negro people of their wartime gains. They are trying to prevent the adoption of governmental measures which must be enacted at once if our country is to avoid the most acute consequences of the trying reconversion period and the cyclical economic crisis which is bound to arise after the war. Likewise, they are vigorously preparing to win a reactionary victory in the crucial 1946 elections.

Already the reactionaries are using the increased cutbacks to lower wages and living standards and to provoke strikes in war industry. They are obstructing the enactment of necessary emergency measures for federal and state unemployment insurance. They are sponsoring vicious anti-labor legislation, such as the new Ball-Burton-Hatch labor relations bill, and are blocking the passage of the FEPC and anti-polltax bills. They are trying to scuttle effective price and rent control and to exempt the wealthy and the big corporations from essential tax legislation. They are endeavoring to place the entire cost of the war and the difficulties of reconversion upon the shoulders of the working people.

If the reactionary policies and forces of monopoly capital are not checked and defeated, America and the world will be confronted with new aggressions and wars and the growth of reaction and fascism in the United States.

3

However, the conditions and forces exist to defeat this reactionary threat and to enable our country to play a more progressive role in world affairs in accord with the true national interests of the American people. For one thing, the military defeat of Nazi Germany has changed the relationship of world forces in favor of democracy. It has enhanced the role and influence of the Land of Socialism. It is bringing into being a new, democratic Europe. It has strengthened those forces in our country and elsewhere which seek to maintain and consolidate the friendship and cooperation of the United States and the Soviet Union—a unity which must now be extended and reinforced if a durable peace is to be secured.

This is evidenced by the fact that the overwhelming majority of the American people, and in the first place the labor movement, which has grown in strength and maturity, is opposed to reaction and fascism, and supports the foreign and domestic policies of the late President Roosevelt as embodied in the decisions of Crimea and in the main features of the Second Bill of Rights.

This is demonstrated by the great mass support for the San Francisco Charter and by the determination of the American people to guarantee that the United Nations security organization shall fulfill its historic objectives—that the amity and unity of action of the American-Soviet-British coalition shall be consolidated in support of the agreements of Teheran, Crimea and Potsdam, shall be

strengthened in the postwar period and made more solid and effective, in order to prevent or check the recurrence of new aggressions and wars.

This majority of the American people must now speak out and assert its collective strength and will. The united power of labor and of all democratic forces, welded in a firm antifascist national unity, must express itself in a decisive fashion as to influence the course of the nation in a progressive direction.

It is imperative that the American people insist that the Truman Administration carry forward the policies of the Roosevelt-labor-democratic coalition for American-Soviet friendship; for the vital social aims of the economic Bill of Rights; for civil liberties; for the rights of the Negro people; and for collective bargaining. It is equally necessary that labor and the people sharply criticize all hesitations to apply these policies and vigorously oppose any concessions to the reactionaries by the Truman Administration, which is tending to make certain concessions under the increasing pressure of the reactionary imperialist combination led by the monopolies.

The Truman Administration, like the Roosevelt government from which it is developing, continues to receive the support of the Roosevelt-labor-democratic coalition, and responds to various class pressures. While it seeks to maintain contact and cooperative relations with labor and the more democratic forces of the coalition, its general orientation in both domestic and foreign policies tends, on some vital questions, to move away from the more consistent democratic forces in the coalition and tries to conciliate certain reactionaries. Hence, it is of central importance to build systematically the political strength and influence of labor, the Negro people, and all true democratic forces within the general coalition for the struggle against imperialist reaction, for combatting and checking all tendencies and groupings in the coalition willing to make concessions to reaction. The camp of reaction must not be appeased. It must be isolated and routed.

Toward this end it is necessary, as never before, to strengthen decisively the democratic unity of the nation, to create that kind of national unity for the postwar period which will be able to facilitate the destruction of fascism abroad and to prevent facism from coming to power in the United States. *Therefore, it is essential to weld together and consolidate the broadest coalition of all anti-fascist and democratic forces as well as all other supporters of Roosevelt's anti-Axis policies.*

To forge this democratic coalition most effectively and to enable it to exercise decisive influence upon the affairs of the nation, it is essential that the working class—especially the progressive labor movement and the Communists—strengthen its independent role and activities and display far greater political and organizing initiative. It is imperative that maximum unity of action be developed among the C. I. O., the A. F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods and that their full participation in the New World Federation of Trade Unions be achieved. It is necessary to rally and imbue the membership and lower officials of the A. F. of L. with confidence in their ability to fight against and defeat the reactionary policies and leadership typified by the Greens, Wolls, Hutchesons and Dubinskys.

While cooperating with the patriotic and democratic forces from all walks of life, labor must, in the first place, strengthen its ties with the veterans, the working farmers, the Negro people, youth, women, intellectuals and small business men, and with their democratic organizations. At the same time, while forging the progressive unity of the nation, labor should cooperate with those capitalist groupings and elements who, for one or another reason, objectively at times, promote democratic aims. But in so doing, labor must depend first of all upon its own strength and unity and upon its alliance with the true democratic and anti-fascist forces of the nation.

The current war and postwar needs of the working class and the nation, including the adoption of an effective reconversion program and the maintenance of workers' living standards, also demand the initiation of large scale mass campaigns to organize the millions of still unorganized workers. This is imperative if organized labor is to achieve its full strength and fulfill its role as the leading democratic force of the nation.

In the vital struggle to crush feudal-fascist-militaristic Japan it is necessary that American labor reaffirm its no-strike pledge and give the necessary leadership to mobilize the people for carrying the war through to final victory and for national liberation aims. In so doing labor must collaborate in the prosecution of the anti-Japanese war with all democratic forces who favor and support complete victory over Japanese imperialism.

However, labor and the other anti-fascist forces must take cognizance of the fact that amongst those big business circles who desire military victory over Japan, there are influential forces, including some in the State Department, who are seeking a compromise peace which will preserve the power of the Mikado after the war, at the expense of China and the other Far Eastern peoples, and directed against the Soviet Union. Similarly, there are powerful capitalist groupings including many in Administration circles, who plan to use the coming defeat of Japan for imperialist aims, for maintaining a reactionary puppet Kuomintang regime in China, for obtaining American imperialist domination in the Far East.

Labor and the people should and will continue to do all in their power to hasten complete victory over Japanese militarism and fascism. And to do this, labor and the popular forces must fight for and rally the people for a consistent anti-fascist and an anti-imperialist policy, and must rely, first of all, upon the people and their democratic organizations and aspirations.

To achieve the widest democratic coalition and the most effective anti-fascist unity of the nation, it is vital that labor vigorously champion a program of action that will promote the complete destruction of fascism, speed victory over Japanese imperialism, curb the powers of the trusts and monopolies, and thereby advance the economic welfare of the people and protect and extend American democracy.

In the opinion of the Communist Party such a program should be based on the following slogans of action:

I. Speed the defeat of fascist-militarist Japan!

Prosecute the war against Japan resolutely to unconditional surrender.

Rout and defeat the advocates of a compromise peace with the Japanese imperialists and war lords. Curb those who seek American imperialist control in the Far East.

Strengthen United Nations cooperation to guarantee post-war peace in the Pacific and the world and to ensure a free democratic Asia with the right of national independence for all colonial and dependent peoples.

Press for a united and free China based upon the unity of the Communists and all other democratic and anti-Japanese forces so as to speed victory. Give full military aid to the Chinese guerillas led by the heroic Eighth and Fourth armies.

Continue uninterrupted war production and uphold labor's no-strike pledge for the duration. Stop employer provocations.

II. Complete the destruction of fascism and build a durable peace!

Cement American-Soviet friendship and unity to promote an enduring peace and to carry through the destruction of fascism.

Carry out in full the decisions made by the Big Three at Teheran, Crimea and Potsdam.

Punish the war guilty without further delay including the German and Japanese staffs and monopolists. Death to all fascist war criminals. Make Germany and Japan pay full reparations.

Strengthen the World Labor Congress as the backbone of the unity of the peoples and the free nations. Admit the World Labor Congress to the Economic and Social Council of the World Security Organization.

Support the San Francisco Charter for an effective international security organization, based upon the unity of the Big Three.

Guarantee to all peoples the right to determine freely their own destiny and to establish their own democratic form of government. Put an end to Anglo-American political and military intervention against the peoples, such as in Greece, Belgium and Italy. Admit Italy to the ranks of the United Nations.

Grant the right of self-determination to Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Support the Puerto Rican and Filipino peoples in their demand for immediate and complete independence.

Break diplomatic relations with fascist Spain and Argentina. Full support to the democratic forces fighting to reestablish the Spanish Republic. Support the struggles of the Latin American peoples for national sovereignty and against the encroachments of American and British imperialism.

Remove from the State Department all pro-fascist and reactionary officials.

Help feed and reconstruct starving and war-torn Europe. Reject the Hoover program based on reactionary financial mortgages, and political interference.

Use the Bretton Woods Agreement in the interests of the United Nations to promote international economic cooperation and expanding world trade. Grant extensive long term loans and credits, at low interest rates, for purposes of reconstruction and industrialization. Expose and combat all efforts of monopoly capital to convert such financial aid into means of extending imperialist control in these countries.

III. Push the Fight for Sixty Million Jobs—Meet the Human Needs of Reconversion!

Make the right to work and the democratic aims of the Second Bill of Rights the law of the land. Support the Murray Full Employment Bill.

Increase purchasing power to promote maximum employment. No reduction in weekly take-home pay when overtime is eliminated.

Revise the Little Steel Formula to increase wages so as to meet the rise in the cost of living. Pass the Pepper 65-cent Minimum Hourly Wage Bill. Support the Seamen's Bill of Rights, H. R. 2346. Defend the wartime gains of the Negro workers in industry.

Establish the guaranteed annual wage in industry.

Establish a shorter work week except where this would hamper war production.

Enforce the right to work and to equality in job status for women. Guarantee the exercise of this right by adequate training, upgrading, seniority rights, as well as by providing day nurseries and child-care centers to aid all working mothers. Safeguard and extend existing social legislation for women, as workers and mothers, and abolish all discriminatory legislation against women.

Support President Truman's proposals for emergency federal legislation to extend and supplement present unemployment insurance benefits as a necessary first step to cope with the current large-scale cutbacks and layoffs. Start employment insurance payments promptly upon loss of job and continue until new employment is found. Provide adequate severance pay for laid-off workers.

Prevent growing unemployment during the reconversion and postwar period by starting large-scale federal, state, municipal and local public works programs—(rural and urban)—slum clearance, low rental housing developments, rural electrification, waterway projects (such as the St. Lawrence and the Missouri Valley), the building of new schools, hospitals, roads, etc.

No scrapping of government-owned industrial plants. Guarantee the operation of these plants, at full capacity for peacetime purposes.

Establish public ownership of the munitions, power and utility industries to place them under democratic control.

Support all measures for full farm production. Defeat the advocates of scarcity. Extend and strengthen the farm price support program. Establish low-cost credit and adequate crop insurance. Safeguard the family-sized farms. Help tenant farmers to become owners. End the semi-feudal sharecropping system in the South.

Maintain and rigidly enforce rent and price control and rationing. Strengthen the law enforcement powers of the OPA. Smash the black market.

Prosecute the war profiteers. No reduction or refunds in corporate, excess profit and income taxes for the millionaires and big corporations. Lower taxes for those least able to pay.

Pass the Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security bill.

IV. Keep Faith With the Men Who Fight for Victory!

Raise substantially dependency allotments to families and relatives of men in the Armed Forces.

Extend and improve the system of democratic orientation and discussion in the Armed Forces. Draw more personnel from labor's ranks into orientation work. Eliminate all anti-labor and anti-democratic material and teachings from the education services conducted in the Armed Forces.

Guarantee jobs, opportunity and security for all returning veterans and war workers, regardless of race, creed or color.

Extend the scope and benefit of the GI Bill of Rights and eliminate all red tape from the Veterans' Administration. Guarantee adequate medical care to every veteran.

Press for the speedy enactment of legislation providing for substantial demobilization pay, based on length and character of service, and financed by taxes on higher personal and corporate incomes.

Insure full benefits of all veterans' legislation to Negro veterans.

V. Safeguard and Extend Democracy!

Enforce equal rights for every American citizen regardless of race, color, creed, sex, political affiliation or national origin.

End Jim Crow. Establish a permanent FEPC on State and National scales. Abolish the poll-tax and the white primary. End every form of discrimination in the Armed Forces. Protect the rights of the foreign-born.

Outlaw anti-Semitism, one of the most pernicious and damaging of fascism's ideological weapons. Support the just demands of the Jewish people for the immediate abrogation by the British government of the imperialist White Paper. Support the upbuilding of a Jewish National Home in a free and democratic Palestine in collaboration with the Arab people, on the basis of the agreement of the Big Three in the Near East.

Protect and extend labor's rights, especially the right to organize, strike and bargain collectively. Repeal all anti-labor laws such as the Smith-Connally Act. Defeat the Ball-Burton-Hatch anti-labor bill.

Outlaw and prohibit all fascist organizations and activities and every form of racial and religious bigotry.

Rescind all anti-Communist legislation.

Curb the powers and policies of the monopolies and trusts which jeopardize the national welfare and world peace. Prosecute and punish all violations of the anti-trust laws. Demand government dissolution of all monopolies and trusts found guilty of attempting to restore the Anglo-German-American cartel system. Revoke their patent rights and prosecute their officials. Enact new legislation subjecting the monopolies to a greater measure of public control with labor, farm and small business representation on all government bodies exercising such supervision.

Protect and extend federal aid to small business.

VI. Safeguard the Future of America's Youth!

Guarantee full and equal opportunity for education and jobs for all youth. Establish an adequate program of training and retraining in new and higher skills during the period of reconversion.

Fix adequate minimum wage standards and guarantee equal pay for equal work to young men and women workers.

Reestablish and strengthen minimum working standards for working minors which have been relaxed during the war. Abolish child labor.

Pass legislation for adequate federal aid to schools and students especially in the South. Establish full and equal opportunity for schooling, including college education. Guarantee full academic freedom.

Enact federal legislation to safeguard the health and well-being of the youth. Develop adequate recreational, cultural and social programs for democratic citizenship in schools and communities as a means to prevent juvenile delinquency.

Establish the right to vote at 18 by State legislation.

Establish a federal government agency, including representation of youth and labor, to develop and coordinate planning to meet the nation's responsibility to youth.

Adopt special safeguards for guaranteeing education, vocational training and job opportunities for Negro youth.

This program meets the most urgent immediate interests of the American people and nation. It is a program of action around which all progressive Americans can unite today. It is a program of action which will advance the struggle for the moral and political defeat of fascism, leading to its final destruction and eradication. It will help create the conditions and guarantees for a stable peace and for a larger measure of economic security and democratic liberties for the masses of the people. The anti-fascist and democratic forces of our nation, being the overwhelming majority of our people, can become strong enough to check and defeat imperialist reaction and to realize the great objectives of this program of action.

As class-conscious American workers, as Marxists, we Communists will do all in our power to help the American working class and its allies to fight for and realize this program. At the same time we will systematically explain to the people that substantial gains for the masses secured under capitalism are inevitably precarious, unstable and only partial and that Socialism alone can finally and completely abolish the social evils of capitalist society, including economic insecurity, unemployment and the danger of fascism and war.

However, this program of action will help the working class and the people as a whole to meet their urgent immediate practical needs, enhancing generally their strength and influence in the nation. In the struggle for the program for peace and democracy, jobs and security, favorable conditions are created for the masses of our people to recognize, on the basis of their own experiences, the need for the eventual reorganization of society along socialist lines.

We shall assist this process by every available educational means, taking full cognizance of the growing interest of the American people and its working class

in the historic experiences of the Soviet people in the building of a new socialist society, which has played the decisive role in the defeat of Hitler Germany and the Axis. We shall aim to convince the broad masses that the eventual elimination of the profit system and the establishment of Socialism in the United States will usher in a new and higher type of democracy and a free road to unlimited and stable social progress because it will end exploitation of man by man and nation by nation, through the establishment of a society without oppression and exploitation.

While not yet accepting Socialism as an ultimate goal, the American people today agree that fascism must be destroyed, wherever it exists or wherever it raises its head. The American people are ready to protect and extend the Bill of Rights and all democratic liberties. They are determined to fight for greater peace and democracy, for the right to work, greater job and social security.

Therefore, Communists and non-Communists, all progressives and anti-fascists can be rallied in support of the above program of immediate action. For this program meets the immediate desires of the American people upon which the majority can unite today to prevent the rise of fascism and to assure victory in the 1945 municipal elections and in the fateful 1946 congressional elections which must be organized and prepared for now. This is a program which must be championed in every factory and industry, in every community and state, through the medium of labor's political action: through labor's joint and parallel action locally, and through broad shop steward conferences and united community movements, as well as through other broad united peoples and democratic front activities.

PART II

5

The foregoing program demands a resolute struggle. The reactionaries will seek desperately to divide the ranks of the people, to pit one group against the other—veterans and farmers against labor, Gentile against Jew, white against Negro, Protestant against Catholic, A. F. of L. against C. I. O. They will strive to break the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition and foment bitter class, racial, partisan and sectional strife. For these purposes they will use Hitler's secret weapon of "white supremacy" and anti-Communism, and make maximum use of the David Dubinsky and Norman Thomas Social-Democrats, the Trotskyites, as well as the John L. Lewises and Matthew Wolls.

To meet this situation the people need a great strengthening of every one of their progressive organizations and particularly the organizations of labor—the trade unions. They need loyal, courageous and honest leadership, men and women who combine clarity of vision with the qualities of firmness in principle and flexibility in tactics. Above all, they require a larger, stronger more influential and more effective mass Communist Party.

The Communists have a greater responsibility to labor and the nation than at any other time in their history. And these greater responsibilities can be fulfilled by us with honor because of our long record of devotion and service to the cause of the working class and the people, and by our adherence to the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The American Communist movement confidently faces the future. We are proud of our consistent and heroic struggle against reaction and fascism over the years. We draw strength from and are particularly proud of our efforts to promote victory over Nazi barbarism and Japanese imperialism.

On the field of battle and on the home front, we Communists have been in the forefront of the fight to defend our country and our people. In the struggle for the establishment of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, for the opening of the Second Front, for defeating fascist-militarist Japan, for national unity, for the reelection of Roosevelt, for the rights of the Negro people, for building a strong and progressive labor movement, for uninterrupted war production and for the attainment of international trade unity—the contributions of the Communists have been vital and second to none.

6

We recognize that the future of the labor and progressive movements and therefore the role of the United States in world affairs will depend to no small extent upon the correctness of our Communist policy, our independent role and influence, our mass activities and organized strength.

That is why today we Communists must not only learn from our achievements in the struggle against fascism and reaction, but also from our weaknesses and errors. In the recent period, especially since January, 1944, these mistakes consisted in drawing a number of erroneous conclusions from the historic significance of the Teheran accord. Among these false conclusions was the concept that after the military defeat of Germany, the decisive sections of big capital would participate in the struggle to complete the destruction of fascism and would cooperate with the working people in the maintenance of postwar national unity. The reactionary class nature of finance capital makes these conclusions illusory. This has been amply demonstrated by recent events revealing the postwar aims of the trusts and cartels which seek imperialist aggrandizement and huge profits at the expense of the people.

This revision of Marxist-Leninist theory regarding the role of monopoly capital led to other erroneous conclusions, such as to utopian economic perspectives and the possibility of achieving the national liberation of the colonial and dependent countries through arrangements between the great powers. It also led to tendencies to obscure the class nature of bourgeois democracy, to false concepts of social evolution, to revision of the fundamental laws of the class struggle and to minimizing the independent and leading role of the working class.

In consequence, we Communists began to carry on the historic struggle against fascism, for democracy and national freedom, in a way that was not always clearly distinguishable from that of bourgeois democrats and bourgeois nationalists, forgetting the class character and limitations of bourgeois democracy and nationalism. Finally, this right-opportunist deviation also tended to ignore, revise or virtually discount the fundamental contradictions of capitalism, declaring wrongly that the changed and changing forms of their expression indicated that they had ceased to operate in the period of the general crisis of capitalism.

Furthermore, the dissolution of the Communist Party and the formation of the Communist Political Association were part and parcel of our revisionist errors, and did in fact constitute the liquidation of the independent and vanguard role of the Communist movement. As a consequence, our base among the industrial workers was seriously weakened. This further resulted in a general weakening of Communist activities and in adversely affecting the role and policies of other Marxist parties in the Western Hemisphere. Far from aiding the carrying out of such correct policy as support for Roosevelt's re-election, the dissolution of the Communist Party weakened the democratic coalition because it weakened the initiative, strength and contributions of the Communist vanguard.

A flagrant expression of this liquidation was the abolition of the Communist organization in the South through its transformation into non-Communist, anti-fascist organizations. This action undermined the foundation for consistent and effective struggle for the needs and aspirations of the masses of the South, especially the Negro people. This glaring example of the logical outcome of our revisionist errors reveals the direction in which our policy was leading. The dissolution of the Communist Party of America and the formation of the C. P. A. was in fact the liquidation of the independent Marxist Party of the working class.

The correction of our revisionist errors demands the immediate reconstitution of the Communist Party and guaranteeing the re-establishment of the Marxist content of its program, policies and activities.

The source of our past revisionist errors must be traced to the ever active pressure of bourgeois ideology and influences upon the working class. The failure on our part to be vigilant and to conduct a sustained struggle against these bourgeois and petty-bourgeois influences permitted their infiltration into our own ranks and sapped our proletarian vitality. One of the most harmful and far reaching consequences of this bourgeois influence upon our organization was the development over a period of years of a system of bureaucratic practices and methods of leadership.

This found expression in a failure to analyze and reexamine constantly our policies and methods of work in the spirit of Marxist self-criticism; to check our policies with the experience of the masses in the class struggle; to develop a correct cadre policy; and to draw our full membership into the shaping and clarification of basic policy. The crassest example of this was the suppression of the Foster letter from the membership. Another example of this bureaucratic method of work was the manner in which the former National Board proceeded to liquidate the Communist organization in the South.

The growth of revisionism was helped by bureaucracy. While the main responsibility for the bureaucratic regime rests upon Browder in the first place, the

former National Board and National Committee must assume a heavy responsibility for the bureaucratic system of work which prevailed in all Party organizations. The former National Board, in accepting the Browder system of leadership, set a bureaucratic example and did not carry on a struggle to establish genuine democracy in the organization. This was also reflected by the former Board's inadequate self-criticism during the pre-convention period.

The incoming National Committee and Board, by example, and with the active assistance of the membership, must undertake an ideological and organizational struggle to root out all vestiges of bureaucracy, and be constantly on guard against relapses to old bureaucratic methods of work and opportunistic practices, which could only obstruct the most rapid and complete correction of our revisionist errors.

The opportunist errors of our former general policy limited the effectiveness of Communist work on the Negro question. This was especially expressed in our glossing over the national character of the Negro question, and in our unwarranted illusion that the big bourgeoisie themselves would carry forward after V-E Day the wartime gains of the Negro people.

It is true that we continued to proclaim our uncompromising demand for full Negro democratic rights, and in many instances fought hard and effectively against Jim Crow practices, especially in the interests of the war effort. However, the struggle for the national liberation of the Negro people as fundamentally related to the whole struggle of the working class against capitalist exploitation and oppression was often lost sight of.

Moreover, our revisionist policies narrowed the scope and weakened the vigor of such struggles, even causing us at times to soft-pedal the struggle to eliminate Negro discrimination in the armed forces.

The results of this opportunist policy are all too apparent. We have not adequately prepared the labor movement and the Negro masses to combat current efforts of reaction to create sharp Negro-white conflicts within the ranks of labor and to wipe out the wartime democratic gains of the Negro people. Despite limited gains we had serious weaknesses and inconsistencies in our work in the Negro communities and have been unable to consolidate our thousands of new Negro recruits into a stable membership. We completely liquidated the Communist organization in the South. We failed to develop a substantial corps of Marxist-trained Negro workers for leadership in the labor movement.

It is now incumbent upon us to give militant leadership to the struggle for Negro democratic rights on all fronts, especially intensifying our educational work among white trade unionists. We must rebuild the Communist organization in the South. We must develop and bring forward a strong corps of working class Negro Communist cadres in the great industrial centers of the nation.

Above all, we must deepen the theoretical understanding of all Communists, both Negro and white, on the fundamental nature and far-reaching implications of the Negro question and conduct a vigorous struggle to root out every manifestation of open or concealed white chauvinism in our own ranks. As one step toward this end, we should create a special commission to undertake a basic study of the conditions and trends of the Negro people in relation to the broad social, economic and political movements in America and the world today, and, in the light of Marxist-Leninist theory, to formulate a comprehensive definition of Communist policy and program on the Negro question.

8

The opportunist errors which we were committing adversely influenced our work during the war, limited the effectiveness of our anti-fascist activities, and were disorienting the Communist and the progressive labor movement for the postwar period.

Our Communist organization was moving toward a crisis, among other things, because of its inability to answer the growing complex problems arising out of the present world situation. This developing crisis could not be resolved without the full recognition and correction of our former revisionist policies.

In this connection, therefore, we must recognize the sterling leadership and the important contributions which Comrade Foster made in the struggle against opportunism. Likewise, we can appreciate the basic correctness of the sound fraternal, Marxist opinions expressed in the recent article of Jacques Duclos, one of the foremost leaders of the Communist Party of France.

Life itself, especially our recent experiences in the struggle against the forces of fascism and reaction on both the foreign and domestic fronts—in the trade

unions, in the struggle for Negro rights, in the struggle against the trusts—has fully confirmed the validity of Comrade Duclos' criticism and of Comrade Foster's repeated warnings, and has fully exposed the basic revisionist errors of American Communist policy since January, 1944.

In ascertaining the grave responsibility for the opportunist errors and mistakes committed in the recent period, it is necessary to state that while Comrade Browder, who was the foremost leader of the C. P. A., bears a proportionately greater share of responsibility than any other individual leader or member, the former national leadership, and in the first place, the former National Board, must and does assume a heavy responsibility for these errors.

9

Clearly, the single, most essential pre-condition necessary to enable us to perform effectively our Communist duties in the postwar period as the vanguard and champion of the interests of the working class and the nation, is to overcome quickly and decisively our errors and mistakes, especially to eradicate all vestiges of opportunism in our policies and mass work.

Toward this end the entire Communist organization must immediately make a thorough and self-critical examination of all policies and leadership. We must establish genuine inner-democracy and self-criticism throughout our organization. We must refresh and strength the personnel of all responsible leading committees in the organization, and establish real collective leadership in all Party committees. In doing this we must combat all tendencies toward factionalism, toward distortions and toward weakening the basic unity of our Communist organization.

At the same time, we Communists must avoid all sectarian tendencies and boldly and energetically expand our own Marxist working class and anti-fascist mass activities and our most active participation in the broad labor and democratic movements. We must resolutely strengthen our independent Communist role and mass activities. We must develop a consistent concentration policy and build our Communist organization especially among the industrial workers. We must wage a resolute ideological struggle on the theoretical front, enhancing the Marxist understanding of our entire organization and leadership.

We Communists renew our pledge to do everything to destroy fascism and reaction, to advance the cause of American and world democracy, the cause of national freedom and social progress. We are determined to cooperate with all anti-fascists and all democratic forces to achieve these great objectives.

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Communist Party of the United States is the political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism. It champions the immediate and fundamental interests of the workers, farmers and all who labor by hand and brain against capitalist exploitation and oppression. As the advanced party of the working class, it stands in the forefront of this struggle.

The Communist Party upholds the achievements of American democracy and defends the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and popular liberties. It uncompromisingly fights against imperialism and colonial oppression, against racial, national and religious discrimination, against Jim Crowism, anti-Semitism and all forms of chauvinism.

The Communist Party struggles for the complete destruction of fascism and for a durable peace. It seeks to safeguard the welfare of the people and the nation, recognizing that the working class, through its trade unions and by its independent political action, is the most consistent fighter for democracy, national freedom and social progress.

The Communist Party holds as a basic principle that there is an identity of interest which serves as a common bond uniting the workers of all lands. It recognizes further that the true national interests of our country and the cause of peace and progress require the solidarity of all freedom-loving peoples and the continued and ever closer cooperation of the United Nations.

The Communist Party recognizes that the final abolition of exploitation and oppression, of economic crises and unemployment, of reaction and war, will be achieved only by the socialist reorganization of society—by the common ownership

and operation of the national economy under a government of the people led by the working class.

The Communist Party, therefore, educates the working class, in the course of its day-to-day struggles, for its historic mission, the establishment of Socialism. Socialism, the highest form of democracy, will guarantee the full realization of the right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and will turn the achievements of labor, science and culture to the use and enjoyment of all men and women.

In the struggle for democracy, peace and social progress, the Communist Party carries forward the democratic traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Lincoln and Frederick Douglass, and the great working class traditions of Sylvis, Debs and Ruthenberg. It fights side by side with all who join in this cause.

For the advancement of these principles, the Communist Party of the United States of America establishes the basic laws of its organization in the following Constitution:

THE SCHNEIDERMAN CASE

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT OPINION

With an introduction by Carol King

INTRODUCTION

The decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of William Schneiderman is a landmark in the development of American constitutional history. The issues at stake in this case transcend the status of any one political party or the rights of any one individual. The issues involve the political liberty of all parties and of all Americans—our freedom to think as we see fit. The Court ruled in favor of the people.

In this introduction I can do more than highlight a few of the issues decided. A thorough reading and study of the Court's opinion as well as the concurring opinions is essential to any complete understanding of their significance.

This is not only an important Court decision. It is a great political document. It reflects a continuing adherence to the principles of democratic thought from earlier political documents on which our country was founded. It represents a growth and development of those principles.

The law reviews will undoubtedly publish long theoretical discussions of the significance of Justice Murphy's opinion (concurring in by Justices Black, Reed, Douglas and Rutledge). But to the man in the street—and to the future of our democracy—its significance is quite clear. It is crystallized in one sentence of the Court's opinion:

"The constitutional fathers, fresh from a revolution, did not forge a political straight-jacket for the generations to come."

The views expressed in Justice Murphy's opinion—which are now the official views of our highest court—constitute a powerful weapon to prevent any straight-jacket from being imposed upon the political activity or minds of the American people.

Most citizens of the United States are not Communists. They are Republicans or Democrats. The rights upheld by this decision are not the rights of Communists alone, but of all Americans of whatever political faith. The decision has secured, to quote the words of Justice Murphy, "the blessings of liberty in thought and action to all those upon whom the right of American citizenship has been conferred by the statute, as well as to the native born." Justice Murphy went on to say:

"... we should not overlook the fact that we are a heterogeneous people. In some of our larger cities a majority of the school children are the offspring of parents only one generation, if that far, removed from the steerage of the immigrant ship, children of those who sought refuge in the new world from the cruelty and oppression of the old, where men have been burned at the stake, imprisoned, and driven into exile in countless numbers for their political and religious beliefs. Here they have hoped to achieve a political status as citizens in a free world in which men are privileged to think and act and speak according to their convictions, without fear of punishment or further exile so long as they keep the peace and obey the law."

The opinion of the Supreme Court in the Schneiderman case helps to assure all Americans, naturalized no less than native born, "a political status as citizens in a free world."

Justice Rutledge, in his concurring opinion, made an extremely important contribution. He wrote, in support of Justice Murphy:

"It may be doubted that the framers of the Constitution intended to create two classes of citizens, one free and independent, one haltered with a lifetime string tied to its status."

The attempt to revoke the citizenship of William Schneiderman made naturalized citizens uneasy. The security of their naturalization and their rights as citizens was at stake. Foreign-born Americans were threatened with being relegated to the status of second-class citizens. The rights of native-born citizens were equally in danger, since freedom of thought and political affiliation were in jeopardy.

It has been deemed not necessary to include in this pamphlet the dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Stone (concurring in by Justices Roberts and Frankfurter). Chief Justice Stone held that there was sufficient evidence to sustain the ruling of the lower courts, which was consequently binding on the Supreme Court "even though, sitting as trial judges, we might have made some other finding."

Great credit is due Wenwell L. Willkie for his fearless and brilliant defense in the Supreme Court not only of the citizenship and political rights of William Schneiderman, but of the citizenship and political rights of all the American people. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born may also be proud, and should be congratulated, for its part in securing this victory.

The American Committee was the only organization that filed a brief amicus asking the Supreme Court to review the decision of the lower courts ordering Schneiderman's citizenship canceled. It was the only organization that filed a brief amicus on the final argument before the Supreme Court. It is fitting that the American Committee should publish the opinion which it helped to secure.

The decision of the Supreme Court was made at a time when the whole world is at war. The Court's opinion is guided by the principles of freedom which are at stake in this war. Letters I have received from soldiers tell me that it has served to encourage them and bolster their morale. It represents one victorious battle in the total war which must be waged until final victory is won against fascism and oppression both at home and abroad.

CAROL KING.

July 15, 1943
New York, N. Y.

PRESS COMMENTS ON MR. WILLKIE'S POSITION

The decision of Mr. Willkie to argue the appeal for Mr. Schneiderman became known yesterday when it was learned that Carol King, chief counsel for the Communist secretary, had requested Mr. Willkie to represent her client before the Supreme Court. Questioned late yesterday afternoon, Mrs. King confirmed this request and said that the 1940 Republican Presidential candidate had accepted her invitation.

Later in the day Mr. Willkie, reached by telephone at his law offices, said that he had agreed to argue the Schneiderman appeal before the Supreme Court. He declared that he considered the case "a vital test case" and one that might possibly affect every naturalized American citizen. He said he would represent Mr. Schneiderman without fee.

While Mr. Willkie declined to discuss the case pending its hearing in Washington some time in January, it is known that he agreed to take it because he firmly believed that the decisions of the two lower Federal courts seriously threatened constitutional rights guaranteed to all citizens, regardless of their political beliefs.

It is expected that conservative and isolationist groups throughout the country will bitterly assail Mr. Willkie for representing the Communist leader before the Supreme Court, but it is known that Mr. Willkie is of the opinion that what he believes is the fundamental principle involved in the case far transcends any of these possible attacks.

He is known to feel that despite the fact that Mr. Schneiderman is an admitted member of the Communist Party, the individual liberties of an American citizen, and not the Communist Party, will be on trial during the appeal. If the Supreme

Court upholds the decision of the lower courts, Mr. Willkie believes that a dangerous and decidedly un-American precedent will have been set that would permit court reviews of the citizenship of all naturalized Americans. Such a step, Mr. Willkie is said to believe, would be contrary to all the principles of the American way of life and would cast a doubt on every naturalized citizen.—*New York Times*, November 29, 1941.

BROADCAST THIS TO GOEBBELS

Two days ago Wendell Willkie, defeated Presidential candidate of the so-called conservative party, stood before our highest court to plead the case of a Communist. It was not an instance of a lawyer obligated by legal ethics to defend a client. Mr. Willkie accepted the case without fee because he believed that an injustice was being done which violated our democratic concept of government. The merits of the case remain to be decided; but Mr. Willkie, for his action, deserves the thanks of all Americans.—Editorial, *New York Times*, November 11, 1942.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 2—October Term, 1942.

William Schneiderman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

ON WRIT OF CETIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT.

[June 21, 1943]

Mr. Justice MURPHY delivered the opinion of the Court.

We brought this case here on ceritorari, 314 U. S. 597, because of its importance and its possible relation to freedom of thought. The question is whether the naturalization of petitioner, an admitted member of the Communist Party of the United States, was properly set aside by the courts below some twelve years after it was granted. We agree with our brethren of the minority that our relations with Russia, as well as our views regarding its government and the merits of Communism are immaterial to a decision of this case. Our concern is with what Congress meant by certain statutes and whether the Government has proved its case under them.

While it our high duty to carry out the will of Congress, in the performance of this duty we should have a jealous regard for the rights of petitioner. We should let our judgment be guided so far as the law permits by the spirit of freedom and tolerance in which our nation was founded, and by a desire to secure the blessings of liberty in thought and action to all those upon whom the right of American citizenship has been conferred by statute, as well as to the native born. And we certainly should presume that Congress was motivated by these lofty principles.

We are directly concerned only with the rights of this petitioner and the circumstances surrounding his naturalization, but we should not overlook the fact that we are a heterogeneous people. In some of our larger cities a majority of the school children are the offspring of parents only one generation, if that far, removed from the steerage of the immigrant ship, children of those who sought refuge in the new world from the cruelty and oppression of the old, where men have been burned at the stake, imprisoned, and driven into exile in countless numbers for their political and religious beliefs. Here they have hoped to achieve a political status as citizens in a free world in which men are privileged to think and act and speak according to their convictions, without fear of punishment or further exile no long as they keep the peace and obey the law.

This proceeding was begun on June 30, 1939, under the provisions of § 15 of the Act of June 29, 1906, 34 Stat. 596, to cancel petitioner's certificate of citizenship granted in 1927. This section gives the United States the right and the duty to set aside and cancel certificates of citizenship on the ground of "fraud" or on

the ground that they were "illegally procured."¹ The complaint charged that the certificate had been illegally procured in that petitioner was not, at the time of his naturalization, and during the five years preceding his naturalization "had not behaved as, a person attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States,"² but in truth and in fact during all of said times, respondent [petitioner] was a member of and affiliated with and believed in and supported the principles of certain organizations then known as the Workers (Communist) Party of America and the Young Workers (Communist) League of America, whose principles were opposed to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and advised, advocated and taught the overthrow of the Government, Constitution and laws of the United States by force and violence." The complaint also charged fraudulent procurement in that petitioner concealed his Communist affiliation from the naturalization court. The Government proceeds here not upon the charge of fraud but upon the charge of illegal procurement.

This is not a naturalization proceeding in which the Government is being asked to confer the privilege of citizenship upon an applicant. Instead the Government seeks to turn the clock back twelve years after full citizenship was conferred upon petitioner by a judicial decree, and to deprive him of the priceless benefits that derive from that status. In its consequences it is more serious than a taking of one's property, or the imposition of a fine or other penalty. For it is safe to assert that nowhere in the world today is the right of citizenship of greater worth to an individual than it is in this country. It would be difficult to exaggerate its value and importance. By many it is regarded as the highest hope of civilized men. This does not mean that once granted to an alien, citizenship cannot be revoked or cancelled on legal grounds. But such a right once conferred should not be taken away without the clearest sort of justification and proof. So, whatever may be the rule in a naturalization proceeding (see *United States v. Manzi*, 276 U. S. 463, 467), in an action instituted under § 15 for the purpose of depriving one of the precious right of citizenship previously conferred we believe the facts and the law should be construed as far as is reasonably possible in favor of the citizen. Especially is this so when the attack is made long after the time when the certificate of citizenship was granted and the citizen has meanwhile met his obligations and has committed no act of lawlessness. It is not denied that the burden of proof is on the Government in this case. For reasons presently to be stated this burden must be met with evidence of a clear and convincing character that when citizenship was conferred upon petitioner in 1927 it was not done in accordance with strict legal requirements.

We are dealing here with a court decree entered after an opportunity to be heard. At the time petitioner secured his certificate of citizenship from the federal district court for the Southern District of California notice of the filing of the naturalization petition was required to be given ninety days before the petition was acted on (§ 5 of the Act of 1906), the hearing on the petition was to take place in open court (§ 9), and the United States had the right to appear, to cross-examine petitioner and his witnesses, to introduce evidence, and to oppose the petition (§ 11). In acting upon the petition the district court

NOTES

Mr. Justice MURPHY

¹ At the time this proceeding was started this section read in part as follows:

"It shall be the duty of the United States district attorneys for the respective districts, or the Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner of Naturalization, upon affidavit showing good cause therefor, to institute proceedings in any court having jurisdiction to naturalize aliens in the judicial district in which the naturalized citizen may reside at the time of bringing suit, for the purpose of setting aside and canceling the certificate of citizenship on the ground of fraud or on the ground that such certificate of citizenship was illegally procured . . ." 8 U. S. C. § 405.

This provision is continued in substance by § 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 1137, 1158, 8 U. S. C. § 738.

² Section 4 of the Act of 1906 provided:

"Fourth. It shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the court admitting any alien to citizenship that immediately preceding the date of his application he has resided continuously within the United States five years at least, and within the State or Territory where such court is at the time held one year at least, and that during that time he has behaved as a man of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same. In addition to the oath of the applicant, the testimony of at least two witnesses, citizens of the United States, as to the facts of residence, moral character, and attachment to the principles of the Constitution shall be required, and the name, place of residence, and occupation of each witness shall be set forth in the record." 34 Stat. 598; 8 U. S. C. § 382.

exercised the judicial power conferred by Article III of the Constitution, and the Government had the right to appeal from the decision granting naturalization. *Tutun v. United States*, 270 U. S. 568. The record before us does not reveal the circumstances under which petitioner was naturalized except that it took place in open court. We do not know whether or not the Government exercised its right to appear and to appeal. Whether it did or not, the hard fact remains that we are here re-examining a judgment, and the rights solemnly conferred under it.

This is the first case to come before us in which the Government has sought to set aside a decree of naturalization years after it was granted on a charge that the finding of attachment was erroneous. Accordingly for the first time we have had to consider the nature and scope of the Government's right in a denaturalization proceeding to re-examine a finding and judgment of attachment upon a charge of illegal procurement. Because of the view we take of this case we do not reach, and therefore do not consider, two questions which have been raised concerning the scope of that right.

The first question is whether, aside from grounds such as lack of jurisdiction or the kind of fraud which traditionally vitiates judgments, cf. *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U. S. 61; *Kibbe v. Benson*, 17 Wall. 624, Congress can constitutionally attach to the exercise of the judicial power under Article III of the Constitution, authority to re-examine a judgment granting a certificate of citizenship after that judgment has become final by exhaustion of the appellate process or by a failure to invoke it.³

The second question is whether under the Act of 1906 as it was in 1927 the Government, in the absence of a claim of fraud and relying wholly upon a charge of illegal procurement, can secure a *de novo* re-examination of a naturalization court's finding and judgment that an applicant for citizenship was attached to the principles of the Constitution.

We do not consider these questions. For though we assume, without deciding, that in the absence of fraud a certificate of naturalization can be set aside under § 15 as "illegally procured" because the finding as to attachment would later seem to be erroneous, we are of the opinion that this judgment should be reversed. If a finding of attachment can be so reconsidered in a denaturalization suit, our decisions make it plain that the Government needs more than a bare preponderance of the evidence to prevail. The remedy afforded the Government by the denaturalization statute has been said to be a narrower one than that of direct appeal from the granting of a petition. *Tutun v. United States*, 270 U. S. 568, 579; cf. *United States v. Ness*, 245 U. S. 319, 325. *Johannessen v. United States* states that a certificate of citizenship is "an instrument granting political privileges, and open like other public grants to be revoked if and when it shall be found to have been unlawfully or fraudulently procured. It is in this respect closely analogous to a public grant of land, . . ." 225 U. S. 227, 238. See also *Tutun v. United States*, *supra*. To set aside such a grant the evidence must be "clear, unequivocal, and convincing"—"it cannot be done upon a bare preponderance of evidence which leaves the issue in doubt". *Maxwell Land-Grant Case*, 121 U. S. 325, 381; *United States v. San Jacinto Tin Co.*, 125 U. S. 273, 300; cf. *United States v. Rovin*, 12 F. 2d 942, 944. See Wigmore, Evidence, (3d Ed.) § 2498. This is so because rights once conferred should not be lightly revoked. And more especially is this true when the rights are precious and when they are conferred by solemn adjudication, as is the situation when citizenship is granted. The Government's evidence in this case does not measure up to this exacting standard.

Certain facts are undisputed. Petitioner came to this country from Russia in 1907 or 1908 when he was approximately three. In 1922, at the age of sixteen, he became a charter member of the Young Workers (now Communist) League in Los Angeles and remained a member until 1929 or 1930. In 1924, at the age of eighteen, he filed his declaration of intention to become a citizen. Later in the same year or early in 1925 he became a member of the Workers Party, the predecessor of the Communist Party of the United States. That membership has continued to the present. His petition for naturalization was filed on January

³ Since 1790 Congress has conferred the function of admitting aliens to citizenship exclusively upon the courts. In exercising their authority under this mandate the federal courts are exercising the judicial power of the United States, conferred upon them by Article III of the Constitution. *Tutun v. United States*, 270 U. S. 568. For this reason it has been suggested that a decree of naturalization, even though the United States does not appear, cannot be compared (as was done in *Johannessen v. United States*, 225 U. S. 227, 238) to an administrative grant of land or of letters patent for invention, and that the permissible area of reexamination is different in the two situations.

18, 1927, and his certificate of citizenship was issued on June 10, 1927, by the United States District Court for the Southern District of California. He had not been arrested or subjected to censure prior to 1927,⁴ and there is nothing in the record indicating that he was ever connected with any overt illegal or violent action or with any disturbance of any sort.

For its case the United States called petitioner, one Humphreys, a former member of the Communist Party, and one Hynes, a Los Angeles police officer formerly in charge of the radical squad, as witnesses, and introduced in evidence a number of documents. Petitioner testified on his own behalf, introduced some documentary evidence, and read into the record transcripts of the testimony of two university professors given in another proceeding.

Petitioner testified to the following: As a boy he lived in Los Angeles in poverty-stricken circumstances and joined the Young Workers League to study what the principles of Communism had to say about the conditions of society. He considered his membership and activities in the League and the Party during the five-year period between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one, before he was naturalized, as an attempt to investigate and study the causes and reasons behind social and economic conditions. Meanwhile he was working his way through night high school and college. From 1922 to about 1925 he was "educational director" of the League. The duties of this non-salaried position were to organize classes, open to the public, for the study of Marxist theory, to register students and to send out notices for meetings; petitioner did no teaching. During 1925 and 1926 he was corresponding secretary of the Party in Los Angeles; this was a clerical, not an executive position. In 1928 he became an organizer or official spokesman for the League. His first executive position with the Party came in 1930 when he was made an organizational secretary first in California, then in Connecticut, and later in Minnesota where he was the Communist Party candidate for governor in 1932. Since 1934 he has been a member of the party's National Committee. At present he is secretary of the party in California.

Petitioner testified further that during all the time he has belonged to the league and the party he has subscribed to the principles of those organizations. He stated that he "believed in the essential correctness of the Marx theory as applied by the Communist Party of the United States," that he subscribed "to the philosophy and principles of Socialism as manifested in the writings of Lenin," and that his understanding and interpretation of the program, principles, and practice of the party since he joined "were and are essentially the same as those enunciated" in the party's 1938 constitution. He denied the charges of the complaint and specifically denied that he or the party advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, and that he was not attached to the principles of the Constitution. He considered membership in the party compatible with the obligations of American citizenship. He stated that he believed in retention of personal property for personal use but advocated social ownership of the means of production and exchange, with compensation to the owners. He believed and hoped that socialization could be achieved here by democratic processes, but history showed that the ruling minority has always used force against the majority before surrendering power. By dictatorship of the proletariat, petitioner meant that the "majority of the people shall really direct their own destinies and use the instrument of the state for these truly democratic ends." He stated that he would bear arms against his native Russia if necessary.

Humphreys testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party and understood he was expelled because he refused to take orders from petitioner. He had been taught that present forms of government would have to be abolished "through the dictatorship of the proletariat" which would be established by "a revolutionary process." He asserted that the program of the party was the socialization of all property without compensation. With regard to the advocacy of force and violence he said: "the Communist Party took the defensive, and put the first users of force upon the capitalistic government; they claimed that the capitalistic government would resist the establishment of the Soviet system, through force and violence, and that the working class would be justified in using force and violence to establish the Soviet system of society."

Hynes testified that he had been a member of the party for eight months in 1922. He stated that the Communist method of bringing about a change in the form of government is one of force and violence; he based this statement upon: "knowledge I have gained as a member in 1922 and from what further knowledge

⁴ The record contains nothing to indicate that the same is not true for the period after 1927.

I have gained from reading various official publications, published and circulated by the Communist Party and from observation and actual contact with the activities of the Communist Party . . . " On cross examination Hynes admitted that he never attempted a philosophic analysis of the literature he read, but only read it to secure evidence, reading and underscoring those portions which, in his opinion, "had to do with force or violence or overthrowing of this system of government other than by lawful means provided in the Constitution." He testified that he never saw any behavior on petitioner's part that brought him into conflict with any law.

The testimony of the two professors discussed Marxian theory as evidenced by the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and concluded that it did not advocate the use of force and violence as a method of attaining its objective.

In its written opinion the district court held that petitioner's certificate of naturalization was illegally procured because the organizations to which petitioner belonged were opposed to the principles of the Constitution and advised, taught and advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, and therefore petitioner, "by reason of his membership in such organizations and participation in their activities, was not 'attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same'." 33 F. Supp. 510, 513.

The district court also made purported findings of facts to the effect that petitioner was not attached to the principles of the Constitution and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same, and was a disbeliever in organized government, that he fraudulently concealed his membership in the League and the Party from the naturalization court, and that his oath of allegiance was false. The conclusion of law was that the certificate was illegally and fraudulently procured. The pertinent findings of fact on these points, set forth in the margin,⁶ are but the most general conclusions of ultimate fact. It is impossible

⁶ For a discussion of the adequacy of somewhat similar testimony by Hynes see *Ex parte Fierstein*, 41 F. 2d 53.

⁶ IV. "The Court finds that it is true that said decree and certificate of naturalization were illegally procured and obtained in this: That respondent [petitioner] was not, at the time of his naturalization by said Court, and during the period of five years immediately preceding the filing of his petition for naturalization had not behaved as, a person attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same.

"The Court finds that it is not true that at the time of the filing of his petition for naturalization respondent was not a disbeliever in or opposed to organized government or a member of or affiliated with any organization or body of persons teaching disbelief in or opposed to organized government.

"The Court finds that in truth and in fact during all of said times respondent had not behaved as a man attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same, but was a member of and affiliated with and believed in and supported the principles of certain organizations known as the Workers Party of America, the Workers (Communist) Party of America, the Communist Party of the United States of America, the Young Workers League of America, the Young Workers (Communist) League of America and the Young Communist League of America, which organizations were, and each of them was, at all times herein mentioned, a section of the Third International, the principles of all of which said organizations were opposed to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and advised, advocated, and taught the overthrow of the Government, Constitution and laws of the United States by force and violence and taught disbelief in and opposition to organized government.

V. "The Court further finds that during all of said times the respondent has been and now is a member of said organizations and has continued to believe in, advocate and support the said principles of said organizations."

VI. (The substance of this finding is that petitioner fraudulently concealed his Communist affiliation from the naturalization court. It is not set forth because it is not an issue here) (See Note 7, *infra*.)

VII. "The court further finds that it is true that said decree and certificate of naturalization were illegally and fraudulently procured and obtained in this: That before respondent [petitioner] was admitted to citizenship as aforesaid, he declared on oath in open court that he would support the Constitution of the United States, and that he absolutely and entirely renounced and abjured all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, and that he would support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and bear true faith and allegiance to the same, whereas in truth and in fact, at the time of making such declarations on oath in open court, respondent [petitioner] did not intend to support the Constitution of the United States, and did not intend absolutely and entirely to renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, and did not intend to support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and/or to bear true faith and allegiance to the same, but respondent at said time intended to and did maintain allegiance and fidelity to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to the said Third International, and intended to adhere to and support and defend and advocate the principles of teachings of said Third International, which principles and teachings were opposed to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and advised, advocated and taught the overthrow of the Government, Constitution and laws of the United States by force and violence."

to tell from them upon what underlying facts the court relied, and whether proper statutory standards were observed. If it were not rendered unnecessary by the broad view we take of this case, we would be inclined to reverse and remand to the district court for the purpose of making adequate findings.

The Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed on the ground that the certificate was illegally procured, holding that the finding that petitioner's oath was false was not "clearly erroneous". 119 F. 2d 500.⁷ We granted certiorari, and after having heard argument and reargument, now reverse the judgments below.

I

The Constitution authorizes Congress "to establish an uniform rule of naturalization" (Art I, § 8, cl. 4), and we may assume that naturalization is a privilege, to be given or withheld on such conditions as Congress sees fit. Cf. *United States v. Macintosh*, 283 U. S. 605, 615, and the dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Hughes, *ibid.*, at p. 627. See also *Tutun v. United States*, 270 U. S. 563, 578; *Turner v. Williams*, 194 U. S. 279. But because of our firmly rooted tradition of freedom of belief, we certainly will not presume in construing the naturalization and denaturalization acts that Congress meant to circumscribe liberty of political thought by general phrases in those statutes. As Chief Justice Hughes said in dissent in the *Macintosh* case, such general phrases "should be construed, not in opposition to, but in accord with, the theory and practice of our Government in relation to freedom of conscience." 283 U. S. at 635. See also Holmes, J., dissenting in *United States v. Schwimmer*, 279 U. S. 644, 653-55.

When petitioner was naturalized in 1927, the applicable statutes did not prescribe communist beliefs or affiliation as such.⁸ They did forbid the naturalization of disbelievers in organized government or members of organizations teaching such disbelief. Polygamists and advocates of political assassination were also barred.⁹ Applicants for citizenship were required to take an oath to support the Constitution, to bear true faith and allegiance to the same and the laws of the United States, and to renounce all allegiance to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty.¹⁰ And, it was to "be made to appear to the satisfaction of the court" of naturalization that immediately preceding the application, the applicant "has resided continuously within the United States five years at least, . . . and that during that time he has behaved as a man of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same."¹¹ Whether petitioner satisfied this last requirement is the crucial issue in this case.

To apply the statutory requirement of attachment correctly to the proof adduced, it is necessary to ascertain its meaning. On its face the statutory criterion is not attachment to the Constitution, but *behavior* for a period of five years as a man attached to its principles and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States. Since the normal connotation of behavior is conduct, there is something to be said for the proposition that the 1906 Act created a purely objective qualification, limiting inquiry to an applicant's previous conduct.¹² If this objective standard is the requirement, petitioner satis-

⁷ That court said it was unnecessary to consider the charge of fraudulent procurement by concealment of petitioner's Communist affiliation. The Government has not pressed this charge here, and we do not consider it.

⁸ The Nationality Act of 1940, while enlarging the category of beliefs disqualifying persons thereafter applying for citizenship, does not in terms make communist beliefs or affiliation grounds for refusal of naturalization, § 305, 54 Stat. 1137, 1141; 8 U. S. C. § 705.

Bills to write a definition of "communist" into the Immigration and Deportation Act of 1918 as amended (40 Stat. 1012, 41 Stat. 1008) and to provide for the deportation of "communists" failed to pass Congress in 1932 and again in 1935. See H. R. 12044, H. Rep. No. 1353, S. Rep. No. 808, 75 Cong. Rec. 12097-108, 72d Cong., 1st Sess. See also H. R. 7120, H. Rep. No. 1023, pts. 1 and 2, 74th Cong., 1st Sess.

⁹ Section 7 of Act of June 26, 1906, 8 U. S. C. § 364.

¹⁰ Section 4 of Act of June 26, 1906, 8 U. S. C. § 381.

¹¹ Section 4 of Act of June 26, 1906, 8 U. S. C. § 382.

¹² The legislative history of the phrase gives some support to this view. The behavior requirement first appeared in the Naturalization Act of 1795, 1 Stat. 414, which was designed to tighten the Act of 1790, 1 Stat. 103. The discursive debates on the 1795 Act cast little light upon the meaning of "behaved," but indicate that the purpose of the requirement was to provide a probationary period during which aliens could learn of our Constitutional plan. Some members were disturbed by the political ferment of the age and spoke accordingly, while others regarded the United States as an asylum for the oppressed and mistrusted efforts to probe minds for beliefs. It is perhaps significant that the oath, which was adopted over the protest of Madison, the sponsor of the bill, did not require the applicant to swear that he was attached to the Constitution, but only that he would support it. See 4 Annals of Congress, pp. 1004-09, 1021-23, 1026-27.

fied the statute. His conduct has been law abiding in all respects. According to the record he has never been arrested, or connected with any disorder, and not a single written or spoken statement of his, during the relevant period from 1922 to 1927 or thereafter, advocating violent overthrow of the Government, or indeed even a statement, apart from his testimony in this proceeding, that he desired any change in the Constitution has been produced. The sole possible criticism is petitioner's membership and activity in the League and the Party, but those memberships *qua* memberships, were immaterial under the 1906 Act.

In *United States v. Schwimmer*, 279 U. S. 644, and *United States v. Macintosh*, 283 U. S. 605, however, it was held that the statute created a test of belief—that an applicant under the 1906 Act must not only behave as a man attached to the principles of the Constitution, but must be so attached in fact at the time of naturalization. We do not stop to reexamine this construction for even if it is accepted the result is not changed. As mentioned before, we agree with the statement of Chief Justice Hughes in dissent in *Macintosh's* case that the behavior requirement is "a general phrase which should be construed, not in opposition to, but in accord with, the theory and practice of our Government in relation to freedom of conscience." 283 U. S. at 635. See also the dissenting opinion of Justice Holmes in the *Schwimmer* case, *supra*, 653-55. As pointed out before, this is a denaturalization proceeding, and it is a judgment, not merely a claim or a grant, which is being attacked. Assuming as we have that the United States is entitled to attack a finding of attachment upon a charge of illegality, it must sustain the heavy burden which then rests upon it to prove lack of attachment by "clear, unequivocal, and convincing" evidence which does not leave the issue in doubt. When the attachment requirement is construed as indicated above, we do not think the Government has carried its burden of proof.

The claim that petitioner was not in fact attached to the Constitution and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States at the time of his naturalization and for the previous five year period is twofold: *First*, that he believed in such sweeping changes in the Constitution that he simply could not be attached to it; *Second*, that he believed in and advocated the overthrow by force and violence of the Government, Constitution and laws of the United States.

In support of its position that petitioner was not in fact attached to the principles of the Constitution because of his membership in the League and the Party, the Government has directed our attention first to petitioner's testimony that he subscribed to the principles of those organizations, and then to certain alleged Party principles and statements by Party Leaders which are said to be fundamentally at variance with the principles of the Constitution. At this point it is appropriate to mention what will be more fully developed later—that under our traditions beliefs are personal and not a matter of mere association, and that men in adhering to a political party or other organization notoriously do not subscribe unqualifiedly to all of its platforms or asserted principles. Said to be among those Communist principles in 1927 are: the abolition of private property without compensation; the erection of a new proletarian state upon the ruins of the old bourgeois state; the creation of a dictatorship of the

1030-58, 1062, 1064-66. See also Franklin, *Legislative History of Naturalization in the United States* (1906), Chapter IV.

The behavior requirement was reenacted in 1802 (2 Stat. 153) at the recommendation of Jefferson for the repeal of the stringent Act of 1798, 1 Stat. 566. See Franklin, *op cit.*, Chapter VI. It continued unchanged until the Act of 1906 which for the first time imported the test of present belief into the naturalization laws when it provided in § 7 that disbelievers in organized government and polygamists could not become citizens. The continuation of the behavior test for attachment is some indication that a less searching examination was intended in this field—that conduct and, not belief (other than anarchist or polygamist) was the criterion. The Nationality Act of 1940 changed the behavior requirement to a provision that no person could be naturalized unless he "has been and still is a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States." 54 Stat. 1142, 8 U. S. C. § 707. The Report of the President's Committee to Revise the Nationality Laws (1939) indicates this change in language was not regarded as a change in substance, p. 23. The Congressional committee reports are silent on the question. The sponsors of the Act in the House, however, declared generally an intent to tighten and restrict the naturalization laws. See 86 Cong. Rec. 11939, 11942 11947, 11949. The chairman of the sub-committee who had charge of the bill stated that "substantive changes are necessary in connection with certain rights, with a view to preventing persons who have no real attachment to the United States from enjoying the high privilege of American nationality." 86 Cong. Rec. 11948. This remark suggests that the change from "behaved as a man attached" to "has been and still is a person attached" was a change in meaning.

proletariat; denial of political rights to others than members of the Party or of the proletariat; and the creation of a world union of soviet republics. Statements that American democracy "is a fraud"¹³ and that the purposes of the Party are "utterly antagonistic to the purposes for which the American democracy, so called, was formed,"¹⁴ are stressed.

Those principles and views are not generally accepted—in fact they are distasteful to most of us—and they call for considerable change in our present form of government and society. But we do not think the government has carried its burden of proving by evidence which does not leave the issue in doubt that petitioner was not in fact attached to the principles of the Constitution and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States when he was naturalized in 1927.

The constitutional fathers, fresh from a revolution, did not forge a political strait-jacket for the generations to come.¹⁵ Instead they wrote Article V and the First Amendment, guaranteeing freedom of thought, soon followed. Article V contains procedural provisions for constitutional changes by amendment without any present limitation whatsoever except that no State may be deprived of equal representation in the Senate without its consent. Cf. *National Prohibition Cases*, 253 U. S. 350. This provision and the many important and far-reaching changes made in the Constitution since 1787 refute the idea that attachment to any particular provision or provisions is essential, or that one who advocates radical changes is necessarily not attached to the Constitution. *United States v. Rorin*, 12 F. 2d 942, 914-45.¹⁶ As Justice Holmes said, "Surely it cannot show lack of attachment to the principles of the Constitution that [one] thinks it can be improved." *United States v. Schwimmer*, *supra* (dissent). Criticism of, and the sincerity of desires to improve the Constitution should not be judged by conformity to prevailing thought because, "if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought that we hate." *Id.* See also Chief Justice Hughes dissenting in *United States v. Macintosh*, *supra*, p. 635. Whatever attitude we may individually hold toward persons and organizations that believe in or advocate extensive changes in our existing order, it should be our desire and

¹³ Program and Constitution of the Workers Party (1921-24).

¹⁴ Acceptance speech of William Z. Foster, the Party's nominee for the presidency in 1928.

¹⁵ Writing in 1816 Jefferson said: "Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence and deem them like the ark of the covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. I knew that age well; I belonged to it, and labored with it. It deserved well of its country. It was very like the present, but without the experience of the present; and forty years of experience in government is worth a century of bookreading; and this they would say themselves, were they to rise from the dead. I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with; because, when once known, we accommodate ourselves to them, and find practical means of correcting their ill effects. But I know also, that laws and institutions must go hand and hand with the progress of the human mind. If that becomes more developed, more enlightened, if any discoveries are made, any truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy, as civilized society to remain as under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors." Ford, *Jefferson's Writings*, vol. X, p. 42.

Compare his First Inaugural Address: "And let us reflect that, having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others, and should divide opinions as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong, that this Government is not strong enough; but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not." Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, vol. I, p. 310 (emphasis added).

¹⁶ See also 18 Cornell Law Quarterly 251; Freund, *United States v. Macintosh*, A Symposium, 26 Illinois Law Review 375, 385; 46 Harvard Law Review 325.

As a matter of fact one very material change in the Constitution as it stood in 1927 when petitioner was naturalized has since been effected by the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment.

concern at all times to uphold the right of free discussion and free thinking to which we as a people claim primary attachment. To neglect this duty in a proceeding in which we are called upon to judge whether a particular individual has failed to manifest attachment to the Constitution would be ironical indeed.

Our concern is with what Congress meant to be the extent of the area of allowable thought under the statute. By the very generality of the terms employed it is evident that Congress intended an elastic test, one which should not be circumscribed by attempts at precise definition. In view of our tradition of freedom of thought, it is not to be presumed that Congress in the Act of 1906, or its predecessors of 1795 and 1802,¹⁷ intended to offer naturalization only to those whose political views coincide with those considered best by the founders in 1787 or by the majority in this country today. Especially is this so since the language used, posing the general test of "attachment" is not necessarily susceptible of so repressive a construction.¹⁸ The Government agrees that an alien "may think that the laws and the Constitution should be amended in some or many respects" and still be attached to the principles of the Constitution within the meaning of the statute. Without discussing the nature and extent of those permissible changes, the Government insists that an alien must believe in and sincerely adhere to the "general political philosophy" of the Constitution.¹⁹ Petitioner is said to be opposed to that "political philosophy," the minimum requirements of which are set forth in the margin.²⁰ It was argued at the bar that since Article V contains no limitations, a person can be attached to the Constitution no matter how extensive the changes are that he desires, so long as he seeks to achieve his ends within the framework of Article V. But we need not consider the validity of this extreme position for if the Government's construction is accepted, it has not carried its burden of proof even under its own test.

The district court did not state in its findings what principles held by petitioner or by the Communist Party were opposed to the Constitution and indicated lack of attachment. See Note 6, *ante*. In its opinion that court merely relied upon *In re Saralieff*, 59 F. 2d 436, and *United States v. Tapolesanyi*, 40 F. 2d 255, without fresh examination of the question in the light of the present record, 33 F. Supp. 510. The Circuit Court of Appeals deduced as Party principles roughly the same ones which the Government here presses and stated "these views are not those of our Constitution." 119 F. 2d at 503-04.

With regard to the Constitutional changes he desired petitioner testified that he believed in the nationalization of the means of production and exchange with compensation, and the preservation and utilization of our "democratic structure . . . as far as possible for the advantage of the working classes." He stated that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" to him meant "not a government, but a state of things" in which the "majority of the people shall really direct their own destinies and use the instrument of the state for these truly democratic ends." None of this is necessarily incompatible with the "general political philosophy" of the Constitution as outlined above by the Government. It is true that the Fifth Amendment protects private property, even against taking for public use without compensation. But throughout our history many sincere people whose attachment to the general constitutional scheme cannot be doubted have, for various and even divergent reasons, urged differing degrees of governmental ownership and control of natural resources, basic means of production, and

¹⁷ See note 12, *ante*.

¹⁸ In 1938 Congress failed to pass a bill denying naturalization to any person "who believes in any form of government for the United States contrary to that now existing in the United States, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization which advocates any form of government for the United States contrary to that now existing in the United States." H. R. 9690, 75th Cong., 3d Sess.

¹⁹ Brief, pp. 103-04. Supporting this view are *In re Saralieff*, 59 F. 2d 436; *In re Van Laken*, 22 F. Supp. 145; *In re Shanin*, 278 Fed. 739. See also *United States v. Tapolesanyi*, 40 F. 2d 255; *Ex parte Saucier*, 81 Fed. 355; *United States v. Olsson*, 196 Fed. 562, reversed on stipulation, 201 Fed. 1022.

²⁰ "The test is . . . whether he substitutes revolution for evolution, destruction for construction, whether he believes in an ordered society, a government of laws, under which the powers of government are granted by the people but under a grant which itself preserves to the individual and to minorities certain rights or freedoms which even the majority may not take away; whether, in sum, the events which began at least no further back than the Declaration of Independence, followed by the Revolutionary War and the adoption of the Constitution, establish principles with respect to government, the individual, the minority and the majority, by which ordered liberty is replaced by disorganized liberty." Brief, p. 105.

²¹ See generally Thorpe, *Constitutional History of the United States* (1901), vol. III, book V.

Compare the effect of the Eighteenth Amendment.

banks and the media of exchange, either with or without compensation. And something once regarded as a species of private property was abolished without compensating the owners when the institution of slavery was forbidden.²¹ Can it be said that the author of the Emancipation Proclamation and the supporters of the Thirteenth Amendment were not attached to the Constitution? We conclude that lack of attachment to the Constitution is not shown on the basis of the changes which petitioner testified he desired in the Constitution.

Turning now to a *seriatim* consideration of what the Government asserts are principles of the Communist Party, which petitioner believed and which are opposed to our Constitution, our conclusion remains the same—the Government has not proved by “clear, unequivocal and convincing” evidence that the naturalization court could not have been satisfied that petitioner was attached to the principles of the Constitution when he was naturalized.

We have already disposed of the principle of nationalization of the agents of production and exchange with or without compensation. The erection of a new proletarian state upon the ruins of the old bourgeois state, and the creation of a dictatorship of the proletariat may be considered together. The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat is one loosely used, upon which more words than light have been shed. Much argument has been directed as to how it is to be achieved, but we have been offered no precise definition here. In the general sense the term may be taken to describe a state in which the workers or the masses rather than the bourgeoisie or capitalists are the dominant class. Theoretically it is control by a class, not a dictatorship in the sense of absolute and total rule by one individual. So far as the record before us indicates, the concept is a fluid one, capable of adjustment to different conditions in different countries. These are only meager indications of the form the “dictatorship” would take in this country. It does not appear that it would necessarily mean the end of representative government or the federal system. The Program and Constitution of the Workers Party (1921–24) criticized the constitutional system of checks and balances, the Senate’s power to pass on legislation, and the involved procedure for amending the Constitution, characterizing them as devices designed to frustrate the will of the majority.²² The 1928 platform of the Communist Party of the United States, adopted after petitioner’s naturalization and hence not strictly relevant, advocated the abolition of the Senate, of the Supreme Court, and of the veto power of the President, and replacement of congressional districts with “councils of workers” in which legislative and executive power would be united. These would indeed be significant changes in our present governmental structure—changes which it is safe to say are not desired by the majority of the people in this country—but whatever our personal views, as judges we cannot say that a person who advocates their adoption through peaceful and constitutional means is not in fact attached to the Constitution—those institutions are not enumerated as necessary in the Government’s test of “General political philosophy,” and it is conceivable that “ordered liberty” could be maintained without them. The Senate has not gone free of criticism and one object of the Seventeenth Amendment was to make it more responsive to the public will.²³ The unicameral legislature is not unknown in the country.²⁴ It is true that this Court has played a large part in the unfolding of the constitutional plan (sometimes too much so in the opinion of some observers), but we would be arrogant indeed if we presumed that a government of laws, with protection for minority groups, would be impossible without it. Like other agencies of government, this Court at various times in its existence has not escaped the shafts of critics whose sincerity and attachment to the Constitution is beyond question—critics who have accused it of assuming functions of judicial review not intended to be conferred upon it, or of abusing those functions to thwart the popular will, and who have advocated various remedies taking a wide range.^{25a} And it is hardly conceivable that the consequence of freeing the legislative branch from the restraint of the executive veto would be the end of constitutional government.^{25b} By this discussion we certainly do not mean to indicate that we would favor such

²² Petitioner testified that this was never adopted, but was merely a draft for study.

²³ See Haynes, *The Senate of the United States* (1938), pp. 11, 96–98, 106–115, 1068–74.

²⁴ Compare Nebraska’s experiment with such a body. *Nebraska Constitution*, Article III, § 1. See 13 *Nebraska Law Bulletin* 341.

^{25a} E. g., the recall of judicial decisions. See Theodore Roosevelt, *A. Charter of Democracy*, S. Doc. No. 348, 62d Cong., 2d Sess. For proposed constitutional amendments relating to the judiciary and this Court see H. Doc. No. 353, pt. 2, 54th Cong., 2d Sess., pp. 144–64; S. Doc. No. 93, 69th Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 83, 86, 93, 101, 111, 123, 133.

^{25b} For an account of the attacks on the veto power see H. Doc. No. 353, pt. 2, 54th Cong., 2d Sess., pp. 129–34.

changes. Our preference and aversions have no bearing here. Our concern is with the extent of the allowable area of thought under the statute. We decide only that it is possible to advocate such changes and still be attached to the Constitution within the meaning of the Government's minimum test.

If any provisions of the Constitution can be singled out as requiring unqualified attachment, they are the guaranties of the Bill of Rights and especially that of freedom of thought contained in the First Amendment. Cf. Justice Holmes' dissent in *United States v. Schwimmer*, *supra*. We do not reach, however, the question whether petitioner was attached to the principles of the Constitution if he believed in denying political and civil rights to persons not members of the Party or of the so-called proletariat, for on the basis of the record before us it has not been clearly shown that such denial was a principle of the organizations to which petitioner belonged. Since it is doubtful that this was a principle of those organizations, it is certainly much more speculative whether this was part of petitioner's philosophy. Some of the documents in the record indicate that "class enemies" of the proletariat should be deprived of their political rights.²⁵ Lenin, however, wrote that this was not necessary to realize the dictatorship of the proletariat.²⁶ The party's 1923 platform demanded the unrestricted right to organize, to strike and to picket and the unrestricted right of free speech, free press and free assemblage for the working class. The 1928 Program of the Communist International states that the proletarian State will grant religious freedom, while at the same time it will carry on antireligious propaganda.

We should not hold that petitioner is not attached to the Constitution by reason of his possible belief in the creation of some form of world union of soviet republics unless we are willing so to hold with regard to those who believe in Pan-Americanism, the League of Nations, Union Now, or some other form of international collaboration or collective security which may grow out of the present holocaust. A distinction here would be an invidious one based on the fact that we might agree with or tolerate the latter but dislike or disagree with the former.

If room is allowed, as we think Congress intended, for the free play of ideas, none of the foregoing principles, which might be held to stand forth with sufficient clarity to be imputed to petitioner on the basis of his membership and activity in the League and the Party and his testimony that he subscribed to the principles of those organizations, is enough, whatever our opinion as to their merits, to prove that he was necessarily not attached to the Constitution when he was naturalized. The cumulative effect is no greater.

Apart from the question whether the alleged principles of the Party which petitioner assertedly believed were so fundamentally opposed to the Constitution that he was not attached to its principles in 1927, the Government contends that petitioner was not attached because he believed in the use of force and violence instead of peaceful democratic methods to achieve his desires. In support of this phase of its argument the Government asserts that the organizations with which petitioner was actively affiliated advised, advocated and taught the overthrow of the Government, Constitution and laws of the United States by force and violence, and that petitioner therefore believed in that method of governmental change.

Apart from his membership in the League and the Party, the record is barren of any conduct or statement on petitioner's part which indicates in the slightest that he believed in and advocated the employment of force and violence, instead of peaceful persuasion, as a means of attaining political ends. To find that he so believed and advocated it is necessary, therefore, to find that such was a principle of the organizations to which he belonged and then impute that principle to him on the basis of his activity in those organizations and his statement that he subscribed to their principles. The Government frankly concedes that "it is normally true . . . that it is unsound to impute to an organization the views expressed in the writings of all its members, or to impute such writings to each

²⁵ ABC of Communism; Lenin, State and Revolution; Statutes, Theses and Conditions of Admission to the Communist International; Stalin, Theory and Practice of Leninism; 1928 Program of the Communist International.

²⁶ "It should be observed that the question of depriving the exploiters of the franchise is purely a Russian question, and not a question of the dictatorship of the proletariat in general. * * * It would be a mistake, however, to guarantee in advance that the impending proletarian revolutions in Europe will all, or for the most part, be necessarily accompanied by the restriction of the franchise for the bourgeoisie. Perhaps they will. After our experience of the war and of the Russian revolution we can say that it will probably be so; but it is not absolutely necessary for the purpose of realizing the dictatorship, it is not an essential symptom of the logical concept 'dictatorship,' it does not enter as an essential condition in the historical and class concept 'dictatorship.'" *Selected Works*, vol. VII, pp. 142-3. (Placed in evidence by petitioner.)

member . . ."²⁷ But the Government contends, however, that it is proper to impute to petitioner certain excerpts from the documents in evidence upon which it particularly relies to show that advocacy of force and violence was a principle of the Communist Party of the United States in 1927, because those documents were official publications carefully supervised by the Party, because of the Party's notorious discipline over its members, and because petitioner was not a mere "rank and file or accidental member of the Party," but "an intelligent and educated individual" who "became a leader of these organizations as an intellectual revolutionary."²⁸ Since the immediate problem is the determination with certainty of petitioner's beliefs from 1922 to 1927, events and writings since that time have little relevance, and both parties have attempted to confine themselves within the limits of that critical period.

For some time the question whether advocacy of governmental overthrow by force and violence is a principle of the Communist Party of the United States has perplexed courts, administrators, legislatures, and students. On varying records in deportation proceedings some courts have held that administrative findings that the Party did so advocate were not so wanting in evidential support as to amount to a denial of due process,²⁹ others have held to the contrary on different records,³⁰ and some seem to have taken the position that they will judicially notice that force and violence is a Party principle.³¹

With commendable candor the Government admits the presence of sharply conflicting views on the issue of force and violence as a Party principle,³² and it also concedes that "some communist literature in respect of force and violence is susceptible of an interpretation more rhetorical than literal."³³ It insists, however, that excerpts from the documents on which it particularly relies, are enough to show that the trial court's finding that the Communist Party advocated violent overthrow of the Government was not "clearly erroneous," and hence cannot be set aside.³⁴ As previously pointed out, the trial court's findings do not indicate the bases for its conclusions, but the documents published prior to 1927 stressed by the Government, with the pertinent excerpts noted in the margin, are: The Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels;³⁵ The State and Revolution by Lenin;³⁶ The Statutes, Theses and Conditions of Admission to the Communist

²⁷ Brief, pp. 23-24.

²⁸ Brief, pp. 25-26.

²⁹ *In re Saderquist*, 11 F. Supp. 525; *Skeffington v. Katzeff*, 277 Fed. 129; *United States v. Curran*, 11 F. 2d 683; *Kenmotsu v. Nagle*, 44 F. 2d 953; *Sormunen v. Nagle*, 59 F. 2d 398; *Branch v. Cahill*, 88 F. 2d 545; *Ex parte Vilarino*, 50 F. 2d 582; *Kjar v. Joak*, 61 F. 2d 566; *Berkman v. Tillinghast*, 58 F. 2d 621; *United States v. Smith*, 2 F. 2d 90; *United States v. Wallis*, 268 Fed. 413.

³⁰ *Strecker v. Kessler*, 95 F. 2d 976, 96 F. 2d 1020, affirmed on other grounds, 307 U. S. 22; *Ex parte Fierstein*, 41 F. 2d 53; *Colyer v. Skeffington*, 265 Fed. 17, reversed *sub nom. Skeffington v. Katzeff*, 277 Fed. 129.

³¹ *United States ex rel. Yokinen v. Commissioner*, 57 F. 2d 707; *United States v. Perkins*, 79 F. 2d 593; *United States ex rel. Fernandez v. Commissioner*, 65 F. 2d 593; *Ungar v. Seaman*, 4 F. 2d 80; *Ex parte Jurgans*, 17 F. 2d 507; *United States ex rel. Fortmueller v. Commissioner*, 14 F. Supp. 484; *Murdoch v. Clark*, 53 F. 2d 155; *Wolck v. Weedlin*, 58 F. 2d 928.

³² Brief, p. 60.

³³ Brief, p. 77. See also *Colyer v. Skeffington*, 265 Fed. 17, 59, reversed *sub nom. Skeffington v. Katzeff*, 277 Fed. 129. And see *Evatt, J.*, in *King v. Hush*; *Ex parte Dcanny*, 48 C. L. R. 487, 516-18.

³⁴ Rule 52 (a) of the Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U. S. C. A., following § 723 (c).

³⁵ The Manifesto was proclaimed in 1848. The edition in evidence was published by the International Publishers in 1932. Petitioner testified that he believed it to be an authorized publication, that he was familiar with the work, that it was used in classes, and, that he thought its principles were correct "particularly as they applied to the period in which they were written and the country about which they were written."

The excerpts stressed are: "The Communists disclaim to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

* * * * *
"Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie."

"In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat."

³⁶ This work was written in 1917 between the February and October Revolutions in Russia. The copy in evidence was published in 1924 by the Daily Worker Publishing Company. Petitioner testified that it was circulated by the Party and that it was probably used in the classes of which he was "educational director".

The excerpts are:

"Fifth, in the same work of Engels, * * * there is also a disquisition on the nature of a violent revolution; and the historical appreciation of its role becomes, with Engels, a veritable panegyric of a revolution by force. This, of course, no one remembers. To talk or even to think of the importance of this idea, is not considered respectable by our modern Socialist parties, and in the daily propaganda and agitation among the

International;²⁷ and The Theory and Practice of Leninism, written by Stalin.²⁸ The Government also sets forth excerpts from other documents which are entitled to little weight because they were published after the critical period.²⁹

masses it plays no part whatever. Yet it is indissolubly bound up with the 'withering away' of the state in one harmonious whole. Here is Engels' argument:

"That force also plays another part in history (other than that of a perpetuation of evil), namely a *revolutionary* part; that as Marx says, it is the midwife of every old society when it is pregnant with a new one; that force is the instrument and the means by which social movements hack their way through and break up the dead and fossilized political forms—of all this not a word by Herr Duehring. Duly, with sighs and groans, does he admit the possibility that for the overthrow of the system of exploitation force may, perhaps, be necessary, but most unfortunate if you please, because all use of force, forsooth, demoralizes its user! And this is said in face of the great moral and intellectual advance which has been the result of every victorious revolution! * * * And this turbid, flabby, impotent, parsons' mode of thinking dares offer itself for acceptance to the most revolutionary party history has ever known'."

"The necessity of systematically fostering among the masses this and only this point of view about violent revolution lies at the root of the whole of Marx's and Engels' teaching, and it is just the neglect of such propaganda and agitation both by the present predominant Social-Chauvinists and the Kautskian schools that brings their betrayal of it into prominent relief."

(Quoting Engels) "Revolution is an act in which part of the population forces its will on the other parts by means of rifles, bayonets, cannon, i. e., by most authoritative means. And the conquering party is inevitably forced to maintain its supremacy by means of that fear which its arms inspire in the reactionaries."

²⁷ Petitioner contends that this document was never introduced in evidence, and the record shows only that it was marked for identification. The view we take of the case makes it immaterial whether this document is in evidence or not. The copy furnished us was printed in 1923 under the auspices of the Workers Party. Hynes testified that it was an official publication, but not widely circulated. Petitioner had no recollection of the particular pamphlet and testified that the American party was not bound by it.

The excerpts are:

"That which before the victory of the proletariat seems but a theoretical difference of opinion on the question of 'democracy', becomes inevitably on the morrow of the victory, a question which can only be decided by force of arms."

"The working class cannot achieve the victory over the bourgeoisie by means of the general strike alone, and by the policy of folded arms. The proletariat must resort to an armed uprising."

"The elementary means of the struggle of the proletariat against the rule of the bourgeoisie is, first of all, the method of mass demonstrations. Such mass demonstrations are prepared and carried out by the organized masses of the proletariat, under the direction of a united, disciplined, centralized Communist Party. *Civil war is war*. In this war the proletariat must have its efficient political officers, its good political general staff, to conduct operations during all the stages of that fight."

"The mass struggle means a whole system of developing demonstrations growing ever more acute in form, and logically leading to an uprising against the capitalist order of the government. In this warfare of the masses developing into a civil war, the guiding party of the proletariat must, as a general rule, secure every and all lawful positions, making them its auxiliaries in the revolutionary work, and subordinating such positions to the plans of the general campaign, that of the mass struggle."

²⁸ The copy in evidence was printed by the Daily Worker Publishing Company either in 1924 or 1925. Petitioner was familiar with the work, but not the particular edition, and testified that it was probably circulated by the Party. He had read it, but probably after his naturalization. Hynes and Humphreys testified that it was used in communist classes.

The excerpts are:

"Marx's limitation with regard to the 'continent' has furnished the opportunists and mensheviks of every country with a pretext for asserting that Marx admitted the possibility of a peaceful transformation of bourgeois democracy into proletarian democracy, at least in some countries (England and America). Marx did in fact recognize the possibility of this in the England and America of 1866, where monopolist capitalism and Imperialism did not exist and where militarism and bureaucracy were as yet little developed. But now the situation in these countries is radically different; Imperialism has reached its apogee there, and there militarism and bureaucracy are sovereign. In consequence, Marx's restriction no longer applies."

"With the Reformist, reform is everything, whilst in revolutionary work it only appears as a form. This is why with the reformist tactic under a bourgeois government, all reform tends inevitably to consolidate the powers that be, and to weaken the revolution."

"With the revolutionary, on the contrary, the main thing is the revolutionary work and not the reform. For him, reform is only an accessory of evolution."

²⁹ (a) Program of the Communist International, adopted in 1928 and published by the Workers Library Publishers, Inc., in 1929:

"Hence revolution is not only necessary because there is no other way of overthrowing the *ruling* class, but also because only in the process of revolution is the *overthrowing* class able to purge itself of the dross of the old society and become capable of creating a new society."

Petitioner "agreed with the general theoretical conclusions stated in" this Program but he regarded "the application of that theory" as "something else".

(b) Programme of the Young Communist International, published in 1929:

"An oppressed class which does not endeavor to possess and learn to handle arms would deserve to be treated as slaves. We would become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists if

The bombastic excerpts set forth in Notes 35 and 38, inclusive, upon which the Government particularly relies, lend considerable support to the charge. We do not say that a reasonable man could not possibly have found, as the district court did, that the Communist Party in 1927 actively urged the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.⁴⁰ But that is not the issue here. We are not concerned with the question whether a reasonable man might so conclude, nor with the narrow issue whether administrative findings to that effect are so lacking in evidentiary support as to amount to a denial of due process. As pointed out before, this is a denaturalization proceeding in which, if the Government is entitled to attack a finding of attachment as we have assumed, the burden rests upon it to prove the alleged lack of attachment by "clear, unequivocal, and convincing" evidence. That burden has not been carried. The Government has not proved that petitioner's beliefs on the subject of force and violence were such that he was not attached to the Constitution in 1927.

In the first place this phase of the Government's case is subject to the admitted infirmities of proof by imputation.⁴¹ The difficulties of this method of proof are here increased by the fact that there is, unfortunately, no absolutely accurate test of what a political party's principles are.⁴² Political writings are often over-exaggerated polemics bearing the imprint of the period and the place in which written.⁴³ Philosophies cannot generally be studied in *vacuo*. Meaning may be wholly distorted by lifting sentences out of context, instead of construing them as part of an organic whole. Every utterance of party leaders is not taken as party gospel. And we would deny our experience as men if we did not recognize that official party programs are unfortunately often opportunistic devices as much honored in the breach as in the observance.⁴⁴ On the basis of the present record we cannot say that the Communist Party is so different in this respect that its principles stand forth with perfect clarity, and especially is this so with relation to the crucial issue of advocacy of force and violence, upon which the Government admits the evidence is sharply conflicting. The presence of this conflict is the second weakness in the Government's chain of proof. It is not eliminated by assiduously adding further excerpts from the documents in evidence to those called out by the Government.

The reality of the conflict in the record before us can be pointed out quickly. Of the relevant prior to 1927 documents relied upon by the Government three are

we forget that we are living in a class society, and that the only way out is through class struggle and the overthrow of the power of the ruling class. Our slogan must be: 'Arming of the proletariat, to conquer, expropriate and disarm the bourgeoisie.' Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its historic task, to throw all arms on the scrap heap. This the proletariat will undoubtedly do. But only then, and on no account sooner."

(c) Why Communism, written by Olgin, and published first in 1933, by the Worker's Library Publishers:

"We Communists say that there is one way to abolish the capitalist State, and that is to smash it by force. To make Communism possible the workers must take hold of the State machinery of capitalism and destroy it."

Petitioner testified that he had not read this book, but that it had been widely circulated by the Party.

⁴⁰ Since the district court did not specify upon what evidence its conclusory findings rested, it is well to mention the remaining documents published before 1927 which were introduced into evidence and excerpts from which were read into the record, but upon which the Government does not specifically rely with respect to the issue of force and violence. Those documents are: Lenin, Left Wing Communism, first published in English about 1920; Bucharin and Preobraschensky, ABC of Communism, written in 1919 and published around 1921 in this country (petitioner testified that this was never an accepted work and that its authors were later expelled from the International); International of Youth, a periodical published in 1925; The 4th National Convention of the Workers Party of America, published in 1925; The Second Year of the Workers Party in America (1924); and, The Program and Constitution of the Workers Party of America, circulated around 1924. With the exception of these last two documents, the excerpts read into the record from these publications contain nothing exceptional on the issue of force and violence. The excerpts from the last two documents stress the necessity for Party participation in elections, but declare that the Party fosters no illusions that the workers can vote their way to power, the expulsion of the Socialist members of the New York Assembly (see Chafee, Free Speech in the United States (1941), pp. 269-82) being cited as an example in point. These statements are open to an interpretation of predilection, not advocacy of force and violence. Cf. Note, 48, *infra*.

⁴¹ As Chief Justice (then Mr.) Hughes said in opposing the expulsion of the Socialist members of the New York Assembly: "... it is of the essence of the institutions of liberty that it be recognized that guilt is personal and cannot be attributed to the holding of opinion or to mere intent in the absence of overt acts; ..." Memorial of the Special Committee Appointed by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, New York Legislative Documents, vol. 5, 143 Session (1926), No. 30, p. 4.

⁴² See Chafee, Free Speech in the United States (1941), pp. 219-24.

⁴³ See Note 33, *ante*.

⁴⁴ See Bryce, the American Commonwealth (1915) vol. II, p. 334; III Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, p. 164.

writings of outstanding Marxist philosophers, and leaders, the fourth is a world program.⁴⁵ The Manifesto of 1848 was proclaimed in an autocratic Europe engaged in suppressing the abortive liberal revolutions of that year. With this background, its tone is not surprising.⁴⁶ Its authors later stated, however, that there were certain countries, "such as the United States and England in which the workers may hope to secure their ends by peaceful means."⁴⁷ Lenin doubted this in his militant work, *The State and Revolution*, but this was written on the eve of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia and may be interpreted as intended in part to justify the Bolshevik course and refute the anarchists and social democrats.⁴⁸ Stalin declared that Marx's exemption for the United States and England was no longer valid.⁴⁹ He wrote, however, that "the proposition that the prestige of the Party can be built upon violence . . . is absurd and absolutely incompatible with Leninism."⁵⁰ And Lenin wrote "In order to obtain the power of the state the class conscious workers must win the majority to their side. As long as no violence is used against the masses, there is no other road to power. We are not Blanquists, we are not in favor of the seizure of power by a minority."⁵¹ The 1938 Constitution of the Communist Party of the United States, which petitioner claimed to be the first and only written constitution ever officially adopted by the Party and which he asserted enunciated the principles of the Party as he understood them from the beginning of his membership, ostensibly eschews resort to force and violence as an element of Party tactics.⁵²

A tenable conclusion from the foregoing is that the Party in 1927 desired to achieve its purpose by peaceful and democratic means, and as a theoretical matter justified the use of force and violence only as a method of preventing an attempted forcible counter-overthrow once the Party had obtained control in a peaceful manner, or as a method of last resort to enforce the majority will if at some indefinite future time because of peculiar circumstances constitutional or peaceful channels were no longer open.

There is a material difference between agitation and exhortation calling for present violent action which creates a clear and present danger of public disorder or other substantive evil, and mere doctrinal justification or prediction of the use of force under hypothetical conditions at some indefinite future time—prediction that is not calculated or intended to be presently acted upon, thus leaving opportunity for general discussion and the calm processes of thought and reason. Cf. *Bridges v. California*, 314 U. S. 252, and Justice Brandeis' concurring opinion in *Whitely v. California*, 274 U. S. 357, 372-80. See also *Taylor v. Mis-*

⁴⁵ See Notes 35 to 38 inclusive *ante*.

⁴⁶ Petitioner testified that he believed its principles, particularly as they applied to the period and country in which written. See note 35, *ante*.

⁴⁷ Marx, Amsterdam Speech of 1872; see also Engels' preface to the First English Translation of Capital (1886).

⁴⁸ Lenin's remarks on England have been interpreted as simply predicting, not advocating, the use of violence there. See the introduction to Strachey, *The Coming Struggle for Power* (1935).

⁴⁹ See Note 38, *ante*.

⁵⁰ Stalin, *Leninism*, vol. I, pp. 282-83. Put in evidence by petitioner.

⁵¹ Lenin, *Selected Works*, vol. VI. Put in evidence by petitioner. In the same work is the following:

"Marxism is an extremely profound and many sided doctrine. It is, therefore, not surprising that scraps of quotations from Marx—especially when the quotations are *not* to the point—can always be found among the 'arguments' of those who are breaking with Marxism. A military conspiracy is Blanquism *if* it is not organized by the party of a definite class; *if* its organizers have not reckoned with the political situation in general and the international situation in particular; *if* the party in question does not enjoy the sympathy of the majority of the people, as proved by definite facts; *if* the development of events in the revolution has not led to the virtual dissipation of the illusions of compromise entertained by the petty bourgeoisie; *if* the majority of the organs of the revolutionary struggle which are recognized to be 'authoritative' or have otherwise established themselves, such as the Soviets, have not been won over; *if* in the army (in time of war) sentiments hostile to a government which drags out an unjust war against the will of the people have not become fully matured; *if* the slogans of the insurrection (such as 'All power to the Soviets,' 'Land to the peasants,' 'Immediate proposal of a democratic peace to all the belligerent peoples, coupled with the immediate abrogation of all secret treaties and secret diplomacy,' etc.) have not acquired the widest renown and popularity; *if* the advanced workers are not convinced of the desperate situation of the masses and of the support of the countryside, as demonstrated by an energetic peasant movement, or by a revolt against the landlords and against the government that defends the landlords; *if* the economic situation in the country offers any real hope of a favorable solution of the crisis by peaceful and parliamentary means."

⁵² Article X, Section 5. "Party members found to be strike-breakers, degenerates, habitual drunkards, betrayers of Party confidence, provocateurs, advocates of terrorism and violence as a method of Party procedure, or members whose actions are detrimental to the Party and the working class, shall be summarily dismissed from positions of responsibility, expelled from the Party and exposed before the general public."

issippi, — U. S. —, Nos. S26-S28 this term. Because of this difference we may assume that Congress intended, by the general test of "attachment" in the 1906 Act, to deny naturalization to persons falling into the first category but not to those in the second. Such a construction of the statute is to be favored because it preserves for novitiates as well as citizens the full benefit of that freedom of thought which is a fundamental feature of our political institutions. Under the conflicting evidence in this case we cannot say that the Government has proved by such a preponderance of the evidence that the issue is not in doubt, that the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States in 1927 towards force and violence was not susceptible of classification in the second category. Petitioner testified that he subscribed to this interpretation of Party principles when he was naturalized, and nothing in his conduct is inconsistent with that testimony. We conclude that the Government has not carried its burden of proving by "clear, unequivocal, and convincing" evidence which does not leave "the issue in doubt," that petitioner obtained his citizenship illegally. In so holding we do not decide what interpretation of the Party's attitude toward force and violence is the most probable on the basis of the present record, or that petitioner's testimony is acceptable at face value. We hold only that where two interpretations of an organization's program are possible, the one reprehensible and a bar to naturalization and the other permissible, a court in a denaturalization proceeding, assuming that it can reexamine a finding of attachment upon a charge of illegal procurement, is not justified in canceling a certificate of citizenship by imputing the reprehensible interpretation to a member of the organization in the absence of overt acts indicating that such was his interpretation. So uncertain a chain of proof does not add up to the requisite "clear, unequivocal, and convincing" evidence for setting aside a naturalization decree. Were the law otherwise, valuable rights would rest upon a slender reed, and the security of the status of our naturalized citizens might depend in considerable degree upon the political temper of majority thought and the stresses of the times. Those are consequences foreign to the best traditions of this nation, and the characteristics of our institutions.

II

This disposes of the issues framed by the Government's complaint which are here pressed. As additional reasons for its conclusion that petitioner's naturalization was fraudulently and illegally procured the district court found, however, that petitioner was a disbeliever in, and a member of an organization teaching disbelief in organized government,⁶³ and that his oath of allegiance, required by 8 U. S. C. § 381, was false. These issues are outside the scope of the complaint,⁶⁴ as is another ground urged in support of the judgment below as to which the district court made no findings.⁶⁵ Because they are outside the scope of the complaint, we do not consider them. As we said in *De Jonge v. Oregon*, "Conviction upon a charge not made would be sheer denial of due process." 299 U. S. 353, 362. A denaturalization suit is not a criminal proceeding. But neither is it an ordinary civil action since it involves an important adjudication of status. Consequently we think the Government should be limited, as in a criminal proceeding, to the matters charged in its complaint.

One other ground advanced in support of the judgment below was not considered by the lower courts and does not merit detailed treatment. It is that

⁶³ In 1927 naturalization was forbidden to such persons by § 7 of the Act of 1906, 34 Stat. 598, U. S. C. § 364. Compare § 305 of the Nationality Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 1141, 8 U. S. C. § 705.

⁶⁴ The complaint did incorporate by reference an affidavit of cause, required by 8 U. S. C. § 405, in which the affiant averred that petitioner's naturalization was illegally and fraudulently obtained in that he did not behave as a man, and was not a man attached to the Constitution but was a member of the Communist Party which was opposed to the Government and advocated its overthrow by force and violence, and in that: "At the time he took oath of allegiance, he did not in fact intend to support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and bear true faith and allegiance to the same".

While this affidavit is part of the complaint, we think it was not intended to be an additional charge, but was included only to show compliance with the statute. The attachment averment of the affidavit is elaborated and set forth as a specific charge in the complaint. The failure to do likewise with the averment of a false oath is persuasive that the issue was not intended to be raised. When petitioner moved for a non-suit at the close of the Government's case, the United States attorney did not contend, in stating what he conceived the issues were, that the question of a false oath was an issue.

⁶⁵ This contention is that petitioner was not well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States because he believed in and advocated general resort to illegal action, other than force and violence, as a means of achieving political ends.

petitioner was not entitled to naturalization because he was deportable in 1927 under the Immigration Act of 1918 (40 Stat. 1012, as amended by 41 Stat. 1008; 8 U. S. C. § 137) as an alien member of an organization advocating overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. This issue is answered by our prior discussion of the evidence in this record relating to force and violence. Assuming that deportability at the time of naturalization satisfies the requirement of illegality under § 15 which governs this proceeding, the same failure to establish adequately the attitude toward force and violence of the organizations to which petitioner belonged forbids his denaturalization on the ground of membership.

The judgment is reversed and the cause remanded to the Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 2—October Term, 1942

William Schneiderman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

[June 21, 1943]

Mr. Justice DOUGLAS, concurring.

I join in the Court's opinion and agree that petitioner's want of attachment in 1927 to the principles of the Constitution has not been shown by "clear, unequivocal and convincing" evidence. The United States, when it seeks to deprive a person of his American citizenship, carries a heavy burden of showing that he procured it unlawfully. That burden has not been sustained on the present record, as the opinion of the Court makes plain, unless the most extreme views within petitioner's party are to be imputed or attributed to him and unless all doubts which may exist concerning his beliefs in 1927 are to be resolved against him rather than in his favor. But there is another view of the problem raised by this type of case which is so basic as to merit separate statement.

Sec. 15 of the Naturalization Act gives the United States the power and duty to institute actions to set aside and cancel certificates of citizenship on the ground of "fraud" or on the ground that they were "illegally procured." Sec. 15 makes nothing fraudulent or unlawful that was honest and lawful when it was done. It imposes no new penalty upon the wrongdoer. But if, after fair hearing, it is judicially determined that by wrongful conduct he has obtained a title to citizenship, the act provides that he shall be deprived of a privilege that was never rightfully his." *Johannessen v. United States*, 225 U. S. 227, 242-243. And see *Luria v. United States*, 231 U. S. 9, 24. "Wrongful conduct"—like the statutory words "fraud" or "illegally procured"—are strong words. Fraud connotes perjury, concealment, falsification, misrepresentation or the like. But a certificate is illegally, as distinguished from fraudulently, procured when it is obtained without compliance with a "condition precedent to the authority of the Court to grant a petition for naturalization." *Maney v. United States*, 278 U. S. 17, 22.

Under the Act in question, as under earlier and later Acts,¹ Congress prescribed numerous conditions precedent to the issuance of a certificate. They included the requirement that the applicant not be an anarchist or polygamist (§ 7), the presentation of a certificate of arrival (*United States v. Ness*, 245 U. S. 319), the requirement that the final hearing be had in open court (*United States v. Ginsberg*; 243 U. S. 472), the residence requirement (R. S. § 2170), the general requirement that the applicant be able to speak the English language (§ 8), etc. The foregoing are illustrative of one type of condition which Congress specified. Another type is illustrated by the required finding of attachment. Sec. 4, as it then read, stated that it "shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the court" that the applicant "has behaved as a man of good moral character; attached

Mr. Justice DOUGLAS

¹ For the Act in its present form see 8 U. S. C. § 501, *et seq.*

to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same."² It is my view that Congress by that provision made the finding the condition precedent, not the weight of the evidence underlying the finding. Such a finding can of course be set aside under § 15 on grounds of fraud. But so far as certificates "illegally procured" are concerned, this Court has heretofore permitted § 15 to be used merely to enforce the express conditions specified in the Act. It is of course true that an applicant for citizenship was required to come forward and make the showing necessary for the required findings. § 4. But under this earlier Act, it was not that showing but the finding of the court which Congress expressed in the form of a condition. If § 15 should be broadened by judicial construction to permit the findings of attachment to be set aside for reasons other than fraud, then the issue of illegality would be made to turn not on the judge being satisfied as to applicant's attachment but on the evidence underlying that finding. Such a condition should not be readily implied.

If an anarchist is naturalized, the United States may bring an action under § 15 to set aside the certificate on the grounds of illegality. Since Congress by § 7 of the Act forbids the naturalization of anarchists, the alien anarchist who obtains the certificate has procured it illegally whatever the naturalization court might find. The same would be true of communists if Congress declared they should be ineligible for citizenship. Then proof that one was not a communist and did not adhere to that party or its belief would become like the other express conditions in the Act a so-called "jurisdictional" fact "upon which the grant is predicated." *Johannessen v. United States*, *supra*, p. 240. But under this Act Congress did not treat communists like anarchists. Neither the statute nor the official forms³ used by applicants called for an expression by petitioner of his attitude on, or his relationship to, communism, or any other foreign political creed except anarchy and the like.

The findings of attachment are entrusted to the naturalization court with only the most general standard to guide it. That court has before it, however, not only the applicant but at least two witnesses. It makes its appraisal of the applicant and it weighs the evidence. Its conclusion must often rest on imponderable factors. In the present case we do not know how far the naturalization court probed into petitioner's political beliefs and affiliations. We do not know what inquiry it made. All we do know is that it was satisfied that petitioner was "attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States." But we must assume that that finding which underlies the judgment granting citizenship (*Cf. Tutun v. United States*, 270 U. S. 568) was supported by evidence. We must assume that the evidence embraced all relevant facts since no charge of concealment or misrepresentation is now made by respondent. And we must assume that the applicant and the judge both acted in utmost good faith.

If the applicant answers all questions required of him, if there is no concealment or misrepresentation, the findings of attachment cannot be set aside on the grounds of illegality in proceedings under § 15. It does not comport with any accepted notion of illegality to say that in spite of the utmost good faith on the part of applicant and judge and in spite of full compliance with the express statutory conditions a certificate was illegally procured because another judge would appraise the evidence differently. That would mean that the United States at any time could obtain a trial *de novo* on the political faith of the applicant.

It is hardly conceivable that Congress intended that result under this earlier Act except for the narrow group of political creeds such as anarchy for which it specially provided. Chief Justice Hughes stated in his dissent in *United States v. Macintosh*, 283 U. S. 605, 635, that the phrase "attachment to the principles of the Constitution" is a general one "which should be construed, not in opposition to, but in accord with, the theory and practice of our Government in relation to freedom of conscience." We should be mindful of that criterion in our construction of § 15. If findings of attachment which underlie certificates may be set aside years later on the evidence, then the citizenship of those whose political faiths become unpopular with the passage of time becomes vulnerable. It is one

² This provision was recast by the Act of March 2, 1929, 45 Stat. 1513-1514, 8 U. S. C. § 707 (a) (3), into substantially its present form. For the legislative history see 69 Cong. Rec. 841; S. Rep. No. 1504, 70th Cong., 2d Sess. The provision now reads: "No person, except as hereinafter provided in this chapter, shall be naturalized unless such petitioner . . . (3) during all the periods referred to in this subsection has been and still is a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States."

thing to agree that Congress could take that step if it chose. See *Turner v. Williams*, 194 U. S. 279. But where it has not done so in plain words, we should be loathe to imply that Congress sanctioned a procedure which in absence of fraud permitted a man's citizenship to be attacked years after the grant because of his political beliefs, social philosophy, or economic theories. We should not tread so close to the domain of freedom of conscience without an explicit mandate from those who specify the conditions on which citizenship is granted to or withheld from aliens. At least when two interpretations of the Naturalization Act are possible we should choose the one which is the more hospitable to that ideal for which American citizenship itself stands.

Citizenship can be granted only on the basis of the statutory right which Congress has created. *Tutun v. United States*, *supra*. But where it is granted and where all the express statutory conditions precedent are satisfied we should adhere to the view that the judgment of naturalization is final and conclusive except for fraud. Since the United States does not now contend that fraud vitiates this certificate the judgment below must be reversed.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 2—October Term, 1942

William Schneiderman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH DISTRICT

[June 21, 1943]

Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE, concurring.

I join in the Court's opinion. I add what follows only to emphasize what I think is at the bottom of this case.

Immediately we are concerned with only one man, William Schneiderman. Actually, though indirectly, the decision affects millions. If, seventeen years after a federal court adjudged him entitled to be a citizen, that judgment can be nullified and he can be stripped of this most precious right, by nothing more than reexamination upon the merits of the very facts the judgment established, no naturalized person's citizenship is or can be secure. If this can be done after that length of time, it can be done after thirty or fifty years. If it can be done for Schneiderman, it can be done for thousands or tens of thousands of others.

For all that would be needed would be to produce some evidence from which any one of the federal district judges could draw a conclusion, concerning one of the ultimate facts in issue, opposite from that drawn by the judge decreeing admission. The statute does not in terms prescribe "jurisdictional" facts.¹ But all of the important ones are "jurisdictional," or have that effect, if by merely drawing contrary conclusion from the same, though conflicting, evidence at any later time a court can overturn the judgment. An applicant might be admitted today upon evidence satisfying the court he had complied with all requirements. That judgment might be affirmed on appeal and again on certiorari here. Yet the day after, or ten years later, any district judge could overthrow it, on the same evidence, if it was conflicting or gave room for contrary inferences, or on different evidence all of which might have been presented to the first court.²

If this is the law and the right the naturalized citizen acquires, his admission creates nothing more than citizenship in attenuated, if not suspended, animation. He acquires but *prima facie* status, if that. Until the Government moves to cancel his certificate and he knows the outcome, he cannot know whether he is in or out. And when that is done, nothing forbids repeating the harrowing process again and again, unless the weariness of the courts should lead them finally to speak *res judicata*.

Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE

¹ Cf., however, the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas.

² There is no requirement that the evidence be different from what was presented on admission or "newly discovered."

No citizen with such a threat hanging over his head could be free. If he belonged to "off-color" organizations or held too radical or, perhaps, too reactionary views, for some segment of the judicial palate, when his admission took place, he could not open his mouth without fear his words would be held against him. For whatever he might say or whatever any such organization might advocate could be hauled forth at any time to show "continuity" of belief from the day of his admission, or "concealment" at that time. Such a citizen would not be admitted to liberty. His best course would be silence or hypocrisy. This is not citizenship. Nor is it adjudication.

It may be doubted that the framers of the Constitution intended to create two classes of citizens, one free and independent, one haltered with a lifetime string tied to its status. However that may be, and conceding that the power to revoke exists and rightly should exist to some extent, the question remains whether the power to admit can be delegated to the courts in such a way that their determination, once made, determines and concludes nothing with finality.

If every fact in issue, going to the right to be a citizen, can be reexamined, upon the same or different proof, years or decades later; and if this can be done *de novo*, as if no judgment had been entered, whether with respect to the burden of proof required to reach a different decision or otherwise, what does the judgment determine? What does it settle with finality? If review is had and the admission is affirmed, what fact is adjudicated, if next day any or all involved can be redecided to the contrary? Can Congress, when it has empowered a court to determine and others to review and confirm, at the same time or later authorize any trial court to overturn their decrees, for causes other than such as have been held sufficient to overturn other decrees?³

I do not undertake now to decide these questions. Nor does the Court. But they have a bearing on the one which is decided. It is a *judgment* which is being attacked. *Tutun v. United States*, 270 U. S. 568. Accordingly, it will not do to say the issue is identical with what is presented in a naturalization proceeding, is merely one of fact, upon which therefore the finding of the trial court concludes, and consequently we have no business to speak or our speaking is appellate intermeddling. That ignores the vital fact that it is a *judgment*, rendered in the exercise of the judicial power created by Article III which it is sought to overthrow,⁴ not merely a grant like a patent to land or for invention.⁵ Congress has plenary power over naturalization. That no one disputes. Nor that this power, for its application, can be delegated to the courts. But this is not to say, when Congress has so placed it, that body can decree in the same breath that the judgment rendered shall have no conclusive effect. Limits it may place. But that is another matter from making an adjudication under Article III merely an advisory opinion or *prima facie* evidence of the fact or all the facts determined. Congress has, with limited exceptions, plenary power over the jurisdiction of the federal courts.⁶ But to confer the jurisdiction and at the same time nullify entirely the effects of its exercise are not matters heretofore thought, when squarely faced, within its authority.⁷ To say therefore that the trial court's function in this case is the same as was that of the admitting court is to ignore the vast difference between overturning a judgment, with its adjudicated facts, and deciding initially upon facts which have not been adjudged. The argument made from the deportation statutes likewise ignores this difference.

It is no answer to say that Congress provided for the redetermination as a part of the statute conferring the right to admission and therefore as a condition of it. For that too ignores the question whether Congress can so condition the judgment and is but another way of saying that a determination, made by an exercise of judicial power under Article III, can be conditioned by legislative mandate so as not to determine finally any ultimate fact in issue.

The effect of cancellation is to nullify the judgment of admission. If it is a judgment, and no one disputes that it is, that quality in itself requires the burden of proof the court has held that Congress intended in order to overturn it. That it is a judgment, and one of at least a coordinate court, which the cancellation proceeding attacks and seeks to overthrow, requires this much at

³ Cf. *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U. S. 61; *Kibbe v. Benson*, 17 Wall. 624. No such cause for cancellation is involved here.

⁴ *Tutun v. United States*, 270 U. S. 568.

⁵ *Cf. Johannessen v. United States*, 225 U. S. 227.

⁶ *Cf. Lockerty v. Phillips*, No. 934, October Term, 1942.

⁷ *United States v. Ferreira*, 13 How. 40; *Gordon v. United States*, 2 Wall. 561; *Id.* 117 U. S. 697; *United States v. Jones*, 119 U. S. 477; *Pocono Pines Assembly Hotels Co. v. United States*, 73 Ct. Cl. 447; 76 Ct. Cl. 334; *Ex parte Pocono Pines Assembly Hotels Co.*, 285 U. S. 526.

least, that solemn decrees may not be lightly overturned and that citizens may not be deprived of their status merely because one judge views their political and other beliefs with a more critical eye or a different slant, however honestly and sincerely, than another. Beyond this we need not go now in decision. But we do not go beyond our function or usurp another tribunal's when we go this far. The danger, implicit in finding too easily the purpose of Congress to denaturalize Communists, is that by doing so the status of all or many other naturalized citizens may be put in jeopardy. The other and underlying questions need not be determined unless or until necessity compels it.

Mr. MUNDT. That is all, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to point out that distinction.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Murdock?

Mr. MURDOCK. I believe the House meets at 11 today, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask first whether we plan to have this witness further than today?

The CHAIRMAN. Our attorney wants half an hour, approximately, with him. I think we had better hold a session this afternoon, if it is agreeable to the gentleman, so as to accommodate Mr. Foster and let him get away. He has been here three days now.

Mr. RANKIN. We have a bill up in the House this afternoon that I think every member here is going to be interested in, very much interested, and I think it would be better to meet tomorrow morning than to meet this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, I will leave the matter in the hands of the committee. I was very anxious because Mr. Foster has been here several days and I wanted to accommodate him if we could.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a good many questions yet to be asked.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I am sure there are.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I raised the question because I want to gage myself accordingly. There are a good many questions in my mind. I want to say to Mr. Foster that I heard his protest at the beginning of the hearing against this procedure on the ground that it is red baiting on the part of the reactionaries. I want to say to the gentleman, whom I have never seen before this hearing, or met, that I do not consider myself a reactionary, and I am not red baiting. So you and I can get along better with that understanding.

I was not quite satisfied with your definition of socialism and communism, as Mr. Mundt put it the other day. I seek information. Would you take about 2 or 3 minutes, if you can do it in that much time, and clearly distinguish between the socialism and communism?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I gave the basic difference yesterday when I stated the fundamental principles underlying the two systems. Socialism is the early stage of communism, and the principle, as I said, is "from everybody according to his ability; to everybody according to his work," whereas, communism is "from everybody according to his ability; to everybody according to his needs."

Under the socialist system, therefore, according to this formula, which was worked out by Karl Marx 100 years ago, various differentials in wages may exist and will exist—in fact, the Communists have carried on very intense struggles against people who have raised the issue in the movement that under socialism there must be a general equality of wages, that this is not in accordance with the principles of socialism; whereas, in a system of communism, as I tried to indicate yesterday, the assumption is that the production problem will be solved, that it will be a relatively easy matter to produce the necessities of life, and the distribution of these will be more or less on a free basis.

Mr. MURDOCK. You would not regard Eugene V. Debs as a communist, would you?

Mr. FOSTER. Debs was a socialist, but he also said that he was a Bolshevik from the top of his head to the soles of his feet.

Mr. MURDOCK. He might have meant that in a figurative way.

Mr. FOSTER. He meant it more than that, I am afraid—I am sure.

Mr. MURDOCK. What would your party do if it were in power in this country that would not be done by the party of Eugene V. Debs or Norman Thomas?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is all speculative. As far as a party led by Mr. Thomas is concerned, I think he would go right along with capitalism pretty much—very slight difference. You introduced yourself as not being engaged in red baiting, and I would like to comment on that, that you may not be inclined in that direction, but this committee is, and I think that the progressive members

on this committee are allowing themselves to be used as window dressing for some of the most hard-boiled reactionaries in the United States.

MR. THOMAS. That is an excellent statement you made, and I think you ought to develop it. You ought to tell who the progressive members are and who are the reactionaries.

MR. FOSTER. I don't know who the progressive members are. I know it is customary in such committees to bring in a few progressive members to sort of cover up the reactionaries and make it a little more palatable to the mass of the people.

MR. MURDOCK. I am sure you are not too well acquainted with Congressional procedure, because we have a definite form of organization in committees of Congress, Mr. Foster.

I have one or two things here now that I would like to inquire about. I grant that every citizen should have freedom of thought within the framework of the Constitution to organize a political party to influence the Government of the United States, and that is not un-American.

MR. FOSTER. That is American.

MR. MURDOCK. That is American. Now, if that political party is influenced in its political control or financially by any group outside the United States, or any power outside the United States, that becomes un-American, in my judgment. Now this is the question: What is the relationship between the Communist Party in the United States and the Communist Party in Russia?

MR. FOSTER. There is no relationship, except that they are both Communist parties. And in answer to your statement about parties being financed or otherwise influenced by foreign parties, I may say that this is precisely the charge that was directed against Jefferson and other democratic leaders of our country who really wanted to make the American Revolution register. The charges that are directed against us are not more severe than were directed against Thomas Jefferson. Read McMaster's History of the United States and see the things that were said against Jefferson. They were baseless, and they were done by the 1800 brand of red baiters, and now we have a repetition of it in the modern set-up.

MR. MURDOCK. That is probably true. You agree with me then that the moment any foreign influence, outside the United States, brings action to bear on any political organization in the United States, that that is dangerous, if it exists?

MR. FOSTER. That depends upon what the character of it is. I remember that the Russian trade unions once gave a certain sum of money to the British coal miners who were on strike, and I think it was perfectly correct that they should do so. I don't think there would be the slightest objection if some bourgeois organization should make a present to another one here in this country, or particularly this country at the present time. We are sending relief to countries all over the world and giving money, sending money to them, and do you consider that wrong? Of course it is not wrong.

MR. MURDOCK. I am not talking about charity.

MR. FOSTER. Well, they collect it for all sorts of purposes, political purposes and everything else.

THE CHAIRMAN. Much as I regret to break into this very interesting discussion, the time has arrived when the House is in session, and the other members of the committee have suggested that we meet at 3 o'clock this afternoon. Does that suit you?

MR. MURDOCK. One more question, Mr. Chairman. As one of the leading members of the Communist Party in America do you know, Mr. Foster, whether your party or any branch of it has received contributions or financial support from outside the United States?

MR. FOSTER. It has not. We have been very careful to avoid it.

MR. MURDOCK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN. We will adjourn until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 10:45 a. m., a recess was taken until 3 p. m. this day.)

AFTER RECESS

The committee reassembled at 3 p. m., pursuant to recess.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, will you resume the stand, please? Mr. Landis, do you desire to ask the witness some questions?

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM Z. FOSTER—Continued

MR. LANDIS. Mr. Foster, I understand from your testimony before the committee that you do not believe in the overthrow of the capitalistic system in the United States by force. Is that correct.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right. I believe in utilizing the democratic institutions of the country.

Mr. LANDIS. Do Communists believe, then, that the end justifies the means, and therefore are not bound by legal or moral consideration?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the means must always be adjusted to the ends.

Mr. LANDIS. Is the principal objective of the Communist Party to establish government ownership and control of our utilities manufacturing the necessities of life?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right, generally speaking.

Mr. LANDIS. If you establish this system in the United States, could you guarantee that our people would be better off?

Mr. FOSTER. In my opinion the people would be much better off. I think that the way we are going now, we are heading into a first class economic disaster, and that there are certain remedial measures that may be taken—I think President Truman gave a pretty good indication to Congress of what must be done to meet the present situation. This, however, we consider as a minimum program, a stopgap for the moment, and Congress by flashing this is exposing the country to a very serious economic crisis. Eventually, however, we are convinced that nationalization will be necessary, and in the long run socialism.

Mr. LANDIS. Did you take a part in changing the Communist Party or dissolving the Communist Party and forming the Association?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LANDIS. That is, were you in favor of it?

Mr. FOSTER. I was not in favor of it but I took part in it.

Mr. LANDIS. Do you agree with some of the forces in the Communist Party, that they should cooperate, and believe that labor and business should cooperate in this period?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I think that our party believes in developing the utmost cooperation with the farmers, with the veterans, with the Negro people, with the small businessmen, also with those capitalists who are prepared to support a program such as that outlined by President Truman in his speech to Congress.

Mr. LANDIS. Of course, I am referring to the situation in the war effort, that capital and labor will cooperate to make the materials to win the war.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, during the war there was pretty general cooperation. There were many big capitalist concerns in the country who exploited the war situation to improve their profits.

Mr. LANDIS. You will admit, though, they did a good job in the war effort toward making the materials and forming the arsenal of democracy to win the war?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say the American people did a good job, particularly the workers did a good job. Of course, the capitalists played their role.

Mr. LANDIS. The cooperation of capitalists and labor combined did the job to build the arsenal of democracy to win the war?

Mr. FOSTER. I must say, however, that all through the war situation it was necessary to carry on a pressure against many of the more powerful corporations of the country. I think they had quite a different objective in this war than the American people had. I think that all through the war they had in mind their imperialist objectives which are now very obvious, whereas the great mass of the people fought for democracy. They truly wanted to abolish fascism.

Mr. LANDIS. What you do really mean by being "imperialist" now?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I can give you some examples. I hold in my hand here a clipping from the New York Times of Sunday, October 14, to the effect—the headline reads "House Republicans Would Bar Relief Funds for European Countries Denying Free Press." The significance of that is that these Republicans, according to the report here, supported by Mr. Martin, want to lay down as a condition for American relief to various countries, that they accept the American tradition of free press. This is dictating political conditions to a country as a condition for financial help. This is imperialism.

Or I can give you one other example. This is from the New York Times of September 18, a report on Mr. Hoover. It is a speech on loans in Chicago. Mr. Hoover develops the thesis that we shall not make loans to countries, among others, that are carrying on a propaganda to upset our government; we shall not subsidize social experiments, and a number of other conditions he lays down. This is an attempt to lay down political conditions to other countries as the basis for American loans, and we know very well what Mr. Hoover's conception of overthrowing the government is. He considered that Mr. Roosevelt was overthrowing the government. This is an imperialist conception of the

United States by virtue of its tremendous financial resources undertaking to dictate the life and political organization of other countries.

Mr. LANDIS. What would you say about Russia being an imperialist country?

Mr. FOSTER. That is not an imperialist country. A socialist country by its very organization cannot be an imperialist country. If I may continue just a sentence of two, here we have a typical example of imperialism, and to try to carry out Mr. Hoover's conception of loans would be to throw the world into chaos, and we, among others, would be the sufferers. This is imperialism, this kind of business, using American financial support or American financial strength to dictate the political organization of another country, which is precisely what Mr. Hoover proposes. As far as you ask me a question about it, I might as well, while I am speaking on this point, answer this gentleman on the end here (Mr. Murdock) who spoke about our receiving money from foreign countries.

I think we should look at the beam in our own eye instead of the mote in somebody else's eye. Here is a typical example of trying to dictate to other countries on the basis of money that we are going to give them. This is not only true with regard to loans in general, but there is a powerful interest in our country that wants to dictate the form of the British government also before giving them the several billion dollar loan that they are now asking. This is imperialism. This is what we mean by "imperialism."

Mr. LANDIS. I just wanted to get that point clear, that you say socialism will be better, or communism will be better, than the system that we have and with which we have built up the arsenal of democracy here, and practically every country in the world is after the United States to get loans.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. LANDIS. Do you expect us to use the capitalistic system and make the money and loan England money to continue the socialist system?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course I do.

Mr. LANDIS. And loan money to Russia to continue their system, when we have made it here with the capitalist system?

Mr. FOSTER. I expect that not only in the interest of the British people but especially in the interest of the American people, it is none of our business what kind of a government they have in England, unless, of course, it is a Fascist government, and then we should not deal with it. But the English people have a perfect right to establish a Labor government if they want to. Not only that, but it is as much to our interest as to the interest of the British to lend them this several billion dollars that they are now asking. I think we should have a very generous loan policy.

Mr. LANDIS. How do you account for the fact that under the capitalistic system we have got some money to loan, and we are the only country that has?

Mr. FOSTER. We escaped the ravages of war. Great Britain was bombed and was much more in the center of war than we were.

Mr. LANDIS. The same condition existed in past years, in peacetimes.

Mr. FOSTER. We are a rich country. That is very obvious, but if we do not make these loans it means that we are going to increase the army of the unemployed in the United States by several million, probably. It is to our interest to make these loans, not simply the British, and when we make these loans we have no business to dictate political terms to these countries. It is no business of ours, and the minute we undertake to tell them what kind of a free press they shall have, or what kind of a socialist or nonsocialist government they shall have, then we are following the imperialistic course. The most that we can ask is that they be friendly governments to us and that we lay down certain economic conditions that we can get our money back.

Mr. LANDIS. Now, you say this is a rich country. We made it richer under the capitalist system.

Mr. FOSTER. If you want me to tell you how we made this money, that is another story, but I just want to say this, that for the past 13 years, since 1914, if it had not been for war, if it had not been for repairing the damages done by war, if it had not been for government subsidies, the United States would by no means be in the rich position that it is at the present time. The fact of the matter is, as we all know, that from 1914 to 1918 we lived on war orders—to 1919, or thereabouts. After that we had a couple of years of depression. During the Coolidge-Harding period we lived to a very large extent on loans that were made to Europe, some 15 or 20 billion dollars in loans. As soon as that played up, the country went into a tailspin in 1929, and we had the situation of some 15 to 17 million unemployed, and for 10 years we never had less than 7 to 10 million unemployed. Now for the past 5 years we have been living on war orders again,

and the only hope we have for the immediate period is to live on repairing damages of this war, and economists that I have read do not except a boom to last more than 3 to 5 years. Then we must do something very drastic, and that drastic is the government must come to the rescue of private industry. As I said yesterday, the day is past in America when the private ownership of industry can keep these industries in operation. It is just gone. That is all.

Mr. LANDIS. Well, if we get continued cooperation of labor and capital, but if you have these forces divided here, one pulling one way and the other the other way—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). That has nothing to do with the economic system.

Mr. LANDIS (continuing). Encouraging a system that is not as good as ours, of course we will have unemployment.

Mr. FOSTER. The cooperation of labor and capital has got nothing to do with the economic prosperity of the country. That has to do with other factors.

Mr. LANDIS. You mentioned a while ago that the English system was their system. You think the form of government that England wants to have or Russia wants to have is their business?

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly.

Mr. LANDIS. But the form of government that we want to have in the United States, that is our business?

Mr. FOSTER. Precisely.

Mr. LANDIS. And we want the system that has worked out best. We want to continue that system. We are the ones that are for that. We will fight for that system, and that is what I intend to do in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. We have a right to whatever system of government or economic system the American people decide upon, but we also have the right to change that system. People who do not agree with that system have a right to change it or propose that changes be made in it, and that is where we come in.

Mr. LANDIS. We have always been responsive to demands of progress and the requirements of common welfare.

Mr. FOSTER. I just want to say in that connection, today the supporters of the capitalist system feel that they have a right to carry on the most militant agitation all over the world in favor of capitalism, and in every country, dictatorially, I may say, but when a Communist raises his head and proposes that maybe capitalism is not the most perfect system in the world, even in countries that are on their back, flat broke, then we take the most violent exception to that. They seem to think that Communists or Socialists have no right to propose a different system and that we alone, all over the world, have the right—that is, the capitalists have the right, to propose the capitalist system.

Mr. LANDIS. If I thought that was the best system and I liked the Communist system the best, the Socialist system the best, I would go to Russia and enjoy their system. That is the way I feel about it.

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is not a question of going to Russia. It is a question of communism in the United States. And not only communism in the United States, but it is making the best of the system that we have got. President Truman is not a Communist—at least, this committee has not called him so yet—I dare say they will further along if he fights for his program—but he has proposed certain remedial measures to get us over our present difficulties, and we are supporting those measures.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe President Truman is immune from being charged with communism in this committee, because Mr. Foster has already labeled him as an imperialist, and he says an imperialist cannot be a Communist. So he is free from criticism.

Mr. FOSTER. President Roosevelt was not immune from it by the Dies Committee, and if President Truman goes to bat like President Roosevelt did for his program, I haven't the slightest doubt but what he will be met in the 1948 election, if he runs, with charges of communism, just the same as Mr. Roosevelt was.

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to finish this question. Don't you believe that labor and capital can cooperate and do a real conversion job, just as well as they did a real war job?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, cooperation—labor has to have at least a living, and if capital is willing to sign agreements carrying on or providing for a decent living for the working men, they will get along together, there are strikes, and there you are. But I would like to say in that respect, I think we have come to a turning point in America.

The CHAIRMAN. What country do you know in this world today, Mr. Foster, where the laboring man has a more decent living than he has in America?

Mr. FOSTER. It just depends on what you mean by "more decent living."

The CHAIRMAN. I will leave it up to you.

Mr. FOSTER. As far as political liberties are concerned, I think unquestionably the Soviet Union, the people generally are entirely upon a higher level of political liberties than we are.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they have better school facilities than we have?

Mr. FOSTER. The Soviet Union is only a growing country.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you say they do not?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I don't say anything of the kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say they do?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that in 1939, at the outbreak of the war—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I am asking you about today, right now.

Mr. FOSTER. The Soviet Union has been ravaged by the war. There has been some 300 billion dollars of damage done to the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Before they got into the war did they have better schools than we have?

Mr. FOSTER. Generally speaking—I am not an expert on schools, but generally speaking I think that the curricula of the schools was certainly in advance of ours, because they taught socialism and ours teaches capitalism. That is very obvious.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is the only thing in which you think they were superior to ours, that they did teach socialism?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I think they had more modern methods of schooling. But I would like to finish my answer, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. I am just trying to find out, did they have better homes than our working people have?

Mr. FOSTER. They were very poor people and they were building, of course, and in 1939 they were worked a 15-year program that would have put them abreast of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. I am just asking you if they did at that time have better homes?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the United States is the most advanced country in the world as far as physical conveniences are concerned. Everybody knows that. But as far as the tempo of development was concerned, the United States was not the fastest developing country. The Soviet Union was developing twice as fast.

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't ask you that. I asked you if, in your opinion, the working people in the Soviet Union, Russia, prior to their entrance into this war, had better homes than the people of America. I understand your answer is "no"?

Mr. FOSTER. I will answer further, that President Roosevelt has given something of an answer to that when he says that with all our wealth in this country, one-third—

The CHAIRMAN. Well, he is not here to be interrogated.

Mr. FOSTER. But he said very definitely that one-third of our population are ill-fed, ill-clad and ill-housed.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your opinion about it? Were the Russian working people in 1939 living in better homes generally than they are in the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. As far as their development, the development of their living standards, which is the important thing, they were developing at a much faster tempo than in the United States, and before the war there were 10 million men walking the streets of the United States unemployed, and not one man walked the streets of the Soviet Union unemployed. I don't know whether you have a workman's background, or not, but I have. I worked 26 years in industry, and I want to answer your question that if there is one thing in the workman's life that is terrible, that is terrific, it is precisely, to be unemployed. Low wages are bad enough. Long hours are bad enough, but unemployment is the grand terror, and there were 10 million unemployed in the United States and not one unemployed in the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, if you don't mind, will you give us an answer to the question propounded? I am talking about the living conditions.

Mr. FOSTER. I have answered that. I said that the United States was the richest country in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that. Then do I understand that your answer is that there isn't any other country where the living conditions of the working people are superior to what they are in America?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no. I don't say that. I say that 10,000,000 unemployed is the most terrifying condition that the working class can face. Of course, where a man is entitled to have a job—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Would you indicate one of those countries where the conditions are better?

Mr. FOSTER. Where the working man has a job and where he has no economic worry whatsoever, I say that that one advantage alone will offset perhaps some difference in wage scale, and any worker will tell you the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, Mr. Landis.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, if I may finish my answer, it is this: I think that we in the United States have come to a turning of the road, where Congress, and the administration for that matter, has to give attention to a basically new policy, that is, the following: That in past years we looked upon wage increases as something that concerned only the worker, that as far as management was concerned it was a minor matter and they paid no further attention to it. But we are past that stage now. We are at the stage now where wage increases are the interest of the Nation. Our entire people, lawyers, doctors, farmers—yes, even business men are definitely interested in improving the wage standards of the workers, whether they know it or not. They must raise the workers' wages, real wages, or else our country is in for the biggest economic crisis in its history. That is only half of what I have to say. The other half is this—and this is the thing that is perhaps news, that we have to learn—and that is that we have got to establish certain price controls. The day is part in America when the employer can raise prices as he sees fit. There has got to be Government machinery worked out that the employer who is going to raise prices will have to show that it is absolutely necessary for the conduct of his business.

Mr. LANDIS. Just so they sell the same goods to all the people at the same price?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. LANDIS. You would not want to charge the poor people more?

Mr. FOSTER. We have got to arrive at a situation where the real wages of the worker are increased, and the employers generally—the railroad owners are not allowed to raise prices as they see fit—railroad rates.

Mr. LANDIS. Well, we have price control now. You realize that?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a war situation, and in my opinion what should be done in these war controls should be abolished as far as labor is concerned, and in other directions as rapidly as possible, but so far as the control of prices is concerned, we must maintain the control of prices.

Mr. LANDIS. We have that today and we are going to have increased wages, and we want to have a system that is better than some other countries have, and we hope to have something better than the W. P. A. system in America, and under the capitalistic system.

Now, you mentioned our late President a while ago, and I would like to read you just a short quotation here and see if you agree with it. I quote:

"What I object to in the American Communists is not their open membership nor even their published objectives. For years in this country they taught a philosophy taught of lies, because I, Mrs. Roosevelt, have experienced the deception of the American Communists. I will not trust them. That is what I meant when I said I did not think the people of this country would tolerate the American Communists who say one thing and mean another."

Mr. FOSTER. That is Mrs. Roosevelt.

Mr. LANDIS. Mrs. Roosevelt; yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, she takes a little flyer in red baiting once in a while. [Laughter.]

That is an example. Generally speaking, Mrs. Roosevelt is a liberal.

Mr. LANDIS. Right.

Mr. FOSTER. I think she has the respect of the American people, and certainly our party would not say anything to diminish her prestige, but like many other liberals, once in a while she takes a little flyer in red baiting.

Mr. LANDIS. I want to get this point over here. I will just finish this quotation while I am at it:

"It is frightening to see any group in our midst proposing to propagandize instead of cooperating. This might lead to war at home and abroad; therefore the French Communist Duclos, and the American Communists who encourage the policy of the world revolution have done the peace a world of harm. The sooner we clear up authoritatively the whole situation of communism outside of the Soviet Union, the better chance we will have of peace in the future. The

Russian people should know this and so should the people of the United States."

Now, the point I want to make there is: This Duclos, the Frenchman, Jacob Duclos, I notice he had some difference in the dissolution of the Communist Party with Earl Browder.

Mr. RANKIN. Whom are you quoting?

Mr. LANDIS. I am quoting Mrs. Roosevelt, and she mentioned that it started over Duclos and his statements coming back after criticizing the dissolution of the Communist Party. Now, there seems to be some difference as to whether the Communists in America are following the Duclos Communist line or whether we are following the other line that Browder was associated with. Is there any difference? That is what I would like to know.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I tried to explain that a couple of days ago. First of all, as far as our party is following the Duclos line, I wrote a letter at the time—well, a couple of years ago—in which I outlined the present line of policy of the party.

Mr. LANDIS. I mean did you agree with his policy?

Mr. FOSTER. Our party is not following the Duclos line particularly, it is following the Communist line.

Mr. LANDIS. He seems to think he is following the Marx-Lenin line more than the rest of them. I just wondered if your policy was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know that he did.

Mr. LANDIS. His statement here in the Daily Worker says that they are back on the Marx-Lenin line, and they want American Communists—he wanted American Communists to go back on that line, and I understood they are doing that.

Mr. FOSTER. He wrote an article, and his article in general agreed with the article that I had written 2 years before.

Mr. LANDIS. You agree with about the same policy that he did?

Mr. FOSTER. Approximately.

Mr. LANDIS. But I understand he believed in the overthrow of the capitalists by revolution, force and violence.

Mr. FOSTER. He doesn't say that. Communists all over the world have the same attitude, if they understand Communist principles that I explained here this morning, and which was very well stated in the decision of the Supreme Court. I for one accept that definitely as the Communist attitude towards force and violence. I think it was a very objective and scholarly analysis by our Supreme Court.

Mr. LANDIS. Do you think our Communist Party ought to remain as a domestic organization and break any and all relations with the Comintern?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no Comintern.

Mr. LANDIS. We don't have any dealings with the Comintern?

Mr. FOSTER. The Comintern dissolved a couple of years ago.

Mr. LANDIS. What other purpose, if any, did the Daily Worker have in blasting General MacArthur after VJ-day, than you mentioned the other day about Japan? Was there any other purpose?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I have stated that I think the policy in Japan is not one that reaches the real Fascist core of the Japanese ruling class, no more than it is in Germany. I didn't have time to read the report of the commission or the expressing beyond to read the list of the men that are indicted in Germany, and this list is not the list of the real Fascist principles in Germany. Of course, these men are all guilty, but the real Fascists in Germany were the great industrialists. They were the ones who organized Fascism in Germany, and Hitler was their stooge, and most of these men who are now indicted are their stooges. They have some big fish like Schacht and Krupp, but there are thousands of others, the big industrialists, who are the real ones. The same situation exists in Japan. I don't know what General MacArthur has in mind, but I have read the list of war criminals that has been presented so far, and I must say that this does not touch the war criminals of Japan, including the Emperor. From the Emperor on down who was the No. 1 Fascist of Japan, and these great industrialists of Japan, are not yet on the list of war criminals, and by letting them escape we are running the danger of facing the same situation again in the near future.

Mr. LANDIS. Of course, I believe he has done a very good job over there myself in handling the situation, and I was wondering why they want to take out after him and smear one of our greatest generals, unless there was some other purpose in it besides probably making Communism work in Japan.

Mr. FOSTER. As I said yesterday, General MacArthur is not playing a military part now particularly. He is playing a civilian role.

Mr. LANDIS. Well, you have to get those war materials away from there.

Mr. FOSTER. He is playing a political role, and I for one and very dubious indeed regarding General MacArthur as a political leader, either in Japan or here or anywhere else.

Mr. LANDIS. You mean, of course, the Communists don't want him to become a candidate for the Presidency in 1948?

Mr. FOSTER. Not only the Communists, but you will find the entire labor movement would not want him, because any man who is the darling of Hearst and the darling of Colonel McCormick will not have the support of the common people of America.

Mr. LANDIS. I thought maybe there would be some other reason, but you know that in Germany and those other countries they have to have the military men to police the situation until they can get it straightened out.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that.

Mr. LANDIS. Japan must be policed. There is no question about that.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that. It is a question of how and what they do.

Mr. LANDIS. Somebody has got to police the situation until they can get things straightened out over there.

Mr. MUNDT. Who would you suggest to do the job if not MacArthur?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no nominations.

Mr. MUNDT. The only living American statesman, I think, that you have spoken friendly towards since you have been here is Henry Wallace. Do you think he could do it?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I am afraid I am not going to give American statesmen a very friendly endorsement. I rather imagine—I tried that with one, Mr. Willkie, this morning.

Mr. MUNDT. I said living statesmen. You did pretty well for Wendell Willkie, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln. The only living statesman you spoke well of was Henry Wallace. Are they any others?

Mr. FOSTER. There are very many men in public life who are honest and respectable men. We judge them according to their policies.

Mr. THOMAS. You are not inferring that General MacArthur is not an honest, respectable man?

Mr. FOSTER. I said what I have to say about General MacArthur.

Mr. THOMAS. You mean to say now that he is not an honest and respectable man?

Mr. FOSTER. I didn't say that. I didn't raise the question of his personal integrity.

Mr. LANDIS. You said he was a darling.

Mr. FOSTER. I said he was a reactionary, and in my judgment with Fascist leanings, and such a man, I think, is a dangerous public man.

Mr. LANDIS. You said he was a darling just a minute ago.

Mr. FOSTER. I said he was a darling of Mr. Hearst.

Mr. LANDIS. Not your darling?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. RANKIN. You say now you think he is a dangerous Fascist?

Mr. FOSTER. I didn't say that. I said that I considered he was a reactionary with Fascist leanings.

Mr. RANKIN. And for that reason dangerous?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. RANKIN. You said you thought he was dangerous?

Mr. FOSTER. Everybody who has Fascist leanings is dangerous.

Mr. LANDIS. If we had a few more men like MacArthur in this country we would be better off. I will say that.

Mr. RANKIN. Amen.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, everybody is entitled to his own opinion, as the old lady said when she kissed the cow.

Mr. MUNDT. I was intrigued by an answer that Mr. Foster gave the chairman in response to a question—I believe you said that the people of Russia enjoy greater political liberties than the people of the United States, speaking of the working classes?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you say that the right to organize and operate in an opposition party is an inherent part of political liberty?

Mr. FOSTER. No. It is under capitalism, but not under socialism.

Mr. MUNDT. You think you can have political liberty without having the freedom to dissent?

Mr. FOSTER. Parties represent classes, generally, and there are no opposing classes in the Soviet Union, so there is no basis for more than one party.

Mr. MUNDT. You do not think there is?

Mr. FOSTER. I know there is just one party in the Soviet Union. I don't have to affirm or deny that. Everybody knows it.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you say that the right to publish an opposition newspaper was inherent as part of political liberty?

Mr. FOSTER. If there is an opposition it should have a right to publish newspapers, and the fact of the matter is that for many years there were such newspapers published.

Mr. MUNDT. Can you name an opposition newspaper in Moscow today?

Mr. FOSTER. There are none. Well, I don't know of any, because there is no opposition. The people are united. It is a difficult thing for you to realize that.

Mr. MUNDT. 190,000,000 people over there are all of one opinion?

Mr. FOSTER. It may seem very humorous that the Russian people are united, but I think if they had not been united, you would probably have a gauleiter in New York and probably in Washington.

Mr. LANDIS. I don't agree with that.

Mr. FOSTER. No; you don't agree with that, now that the war is over, but this same General MacArthur expressed himself very much along this line and said if it had not been for the unity of the Russian people, unquestionably they could not have made the great fight that they did.

Mr. LANDIS. We made our own fight.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very difficult for us, living in a capitalist country where we have a class struggle and we have also all sorts of conflicting class interests, to think of a people who are really united, but that is what happens under socialism, unity.

Mr. MUNDT. Do you think the United States made any important contribution to winning this war?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course. How could I think otherwise?

Mr. MUNDT. I don't know how you could, but you implied that we were not united because we have a free press over here and opposition parties.

Mr. FOSTER. I didn't say anything of the kind. I think the United States played a very important part in the war, but I also think that at that critical moment before the United States was ready, if it had not been for the unity of the Russian people this war would have been lost before we got into it.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it your position, then, that the people of Russia have complete freedom to organize opposition political parties and publish opposition newspapers, and the reason they do not do it is that nobody over there opposes the present regime?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is correct; yes. The people of the Soviet Union are socialists and they don't see any necessity to oppose the present regime.

Mr. MUNDT. What was the great educational process employed by which in the course of, say, 20 years, 190,000,000 people all came to think simultaneously about the same thing in every way?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is a long story.

Mr. MUNDT. But it would be very informative. That is a great educational achievement.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know what all this talk about the Soviet Union has got to do with un-American activities here. I don't think this committee should permit such talk.

Mr. MUNDT. You brought the Soviet Union into the picture. I didn't. You brought it in.

Mr. FOSTER. I doubt it. I might have made some general reference to the Soviet Union, but where a committee of the United States Government takes up the question of an Ally, of a member of the United Nations, with the deliberate attempt to—well, slander it or lower its prestige, I think that is infamous.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I think that remark is out of order and should be stricken from the record.

The CHAIRMAN. This committee is not doing anything of the sort, and the question of the Soviet Republic of Russia was brought into this discussion by you making an analogy between it and our Government.

Mr. LANDIS. Do you think we could go over to Russia, Mr. Foster, —

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). I was asked a question and I answered it.

Mr. LANDIS. Do you think we could go over to Russia and step in there and tell them to change their form of government from a socialist system over there?

Mr. FOSTER. To a capitalist system?

Mr. LANDIS. Change it to any kind of system?

Mr. FOSTER. If we would tell them that over there I think they would think you were crazy.

Mr. LANDIS. We think that in the United States, that they are crazy in wanting to change ours too, if that is the case.

Mr. MUNDT. Another question, along that same line. I understood Mr. Foster expressed great concern because he read in the newspapers that the Republicans had suggested that as one of the prerequisites for getting relief there be free press in these areas. Do I understand from that that the Communist Party does not stand for a free press?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is the business of the people themselves, and that the United States Government has no business to walk into a country and tell them how and why and where they shall organize their press.

The CHAIRMAN. The question asked you is, does the Communist Party to which you belong today subscribe to the doctrine of free press?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course.

The CHAIRMAN. That answers it.

Mr. MUNDT. You subscribe to that?

Mr. FOSTER. I subscribe to that, but with the United States stepping into these countries I can very well imagine that it would be Mr. Hearst or Mr. McCormick or someone of that character who would undertake to tell these people just what kind of a free press they should have.

Mr. MUNDT. You are expressing too vivid an imagination.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no; I just look out over the scene here and see who is telling us what kind of a free press we should have.

Mr. MUNDT. I don't believe either Mr. Hearst or Mr. McCormick has very much authority in the present administration. I don't believe they could determine who is going to define free press, but the resolution, for your information, that we are talking about, deals with freedom of information. Do you think it is wrong as a prerequisite for our extending relief to various areas, that we have permission to have newspaper reporters go in there and send back information without censorship? That is what the resolution says.

Mr. FOSTER. All I know is this report that I have just cited to you, and if the proposal is that they will refuse bread and butter and milk to children and starve the people until they establish a free press as we dictate, I say that is wrong. Our job is to feed them. We had that in the last war. I might say on that general proposition, I stated at the outset that Mr. Hoover has more influence in the administration, particularly in Congress now, than President Truman has.

Mr. MUNDT. A great compliment to Mr. Hoover.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I don't know. When I look over what Congress is doing, I don't think I would consider it much of a compliment, what our Congress is doing.

Mr. LANDIS. Well, we have done some pretty good things.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. He has not answered my specific question. Forgetting about any definition of free press, Mr. Foster, the resolution I am talking about deals with making it a prerequisite for the extension of this relief to permit reporters from those areas to send back to all of the countries, Britain, France, Russia, the United States, information without being censored.

Mr. FOSTER. My opinion on that is that our job is to send in a relief organization, and as far as the free press within the borders of a country is concerned, that is up to that country to determine for itself. We have no right to dictate as to news services and so on, and say "If you don't do this we are not going to give you any bread and butter."

Mr. MUNDT. Do you say relief should go to Fascist countries?

Mr. FOSTER. The Fascist country is our enemy, and we treat them as enemies.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not send relief to them at all?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I have one or two questions. Yesterday you referred to a man by the name of Ryan in New York. Who is Mr. Ryan?

Mr. FOSTER. He is head of the longshoremen union. He is elected for life, and he is the king of the longshoremen.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean there isn't any authority that can get him out?

Mr. FOSTER. The man is elected for life, and he carries the constitution in his pocket. They rarely hold any meetings. Conventions are practically unknown amongst them, and try and get him out.

Mr. MUNDT. A great manifestation of unity on the part of his people.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The Fascists also had unity. There can be different kinds of unity.

Mr. RANKIN. What organization does he represent?

Mr. FOSTER. He is head of the National Longshoremen's Association.

Mr. RANKIN. He is head of the labor union?

Mr. FOSTER. That is it. That is the name of it.

Mr. RANKIN. Affiliated with the National Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. With the A. F. of L.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you know what his salary is?

Mr. FOSTER. I see by the papers it is \$20,000 a year salary, and a heavy expense account, which probably runs to another \$20,000.

Mr. RANKIN. I may be wrong, but I was under the impression that the American Federation of Labor had a right, had not only the right but the power to remove any of their people at any time they became dissatisfied with them.

Mr. FOSTER. No, the American Federation of Labor is organized on the basis of craft autonomy. The respective international unions have a very high degree of self-government, and they pick out their own leaders, and they are very jealous of the right to do that. However, the American Federation of Labor has great moral strength in a situation like that, and if it were to come out and condemn Mr. Ryan and cite his various infractions against democracy, undoubtedly the workers of his union would be encouraged to depose him. They have a moral strength in the situation, and I think that is as far as their legal power goes under their constitution.

Mr. RANKIN. Is Mr. Ryan a members of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I hope not. Of course not.

Mr. RANKIN. I was asking for information. I don't know him, never heard of him until he was mentioned here a day or so ago. I am asking for information.

On yesterday you said that Secretary Byrnes had disrupted the conference in London. What did you mean by that?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I do not have access to the inner-meanings in which the policies are decided upon, like other American citizens I read the newspapers, and I draw my conclusions therefrom.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, Mr. Byrnes was representing the American people, was he not, in his attitude?

Mr. FOSTER. He represented the administration. Whether he represented the American people, that is something else again. I don't think he did. Mr. Byrnes, according to the reports in the newspapers, has the theory that the proper policy is to get tough with the Soviet Union, and this is an example of getting tough with the Soviet Union. According to the newspaper reports which were widely broadcast at the time of the San Francisco United Nations Conference, it was reported that Mr. Byrnes advised the President that the policy to follow at San Francisco was to get tough with the Soviet Union. This was done with the result that we saw that the conference was almost wrecked between the activities of Mr. Stettinius and Senator Vandenberg, and I don't think the American people liked that.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not asking about the San Francisco conference.

Mr. FOSTER. But you asked me about the American people.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I asked you about—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). And Mr. Byrnes' hand was behind that, and if I am able to judge American sentiment they very seriously disagreed with Mr. Byrnes' policy with regard to the San Francisco Conference.

Mr. RANKIN. Now then, you were speaking about the conference in London?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, also, and this is another expression of the same policy of getting tough with the Soviet Union, and I think it is a very disastrous policy. I don't think we can deal with our allies and our friends in this manner.

Mr. RANKIN. Didn't they get tough with us? Would you advise Mr. Byrnes not to stiffen up and manifest his authority or the authority of the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. I didn't see the Soviet Union get tough.

Mr. RANKIN. Yet Mr. Byrnes got tough with the Soviet Union?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, because Mr. Byrnes has the theory of getting tough with the Soviet Union. Not only that, but that theory is widely spread here in Washington,

and the biggest reactionaries in the country are the loudest in their applause of Mr. Byrnes precisely for getting tough with the Soviet Union.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, the feeling as I get it is that Mr. Byrnes is representing not only the American Government but he is representing the sentiment of the American people in standing out for the rights of the United States and for those policies that will make for peace throughout the world.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the rights of the American people nor the interests of the American people, and I haven't the slightest doubt but what was done at London will be reversed.

Mr. RANKIN. By whom?

Mr. FOSTER. By the Big Three when they eventually get together. They will arrive at a friendly estimate of adjustment of their difficulties, which Mr. Byrnes, in my opinion, made no effort whatever to do.

Mr. RANKIN. You think that Mr. Byrnes made no effort to iron out the difficulties?

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, Mr. Byrnes was not by himself at that conference. France and Great Britain were both represented.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, he had Mr. Dulles there also, a big help.

Mr. RANKIN. In what way was he a big help?

Mr. FOSTER. He was a big help to split the conference. We have learned not only how to split the atom but I think we have learned how to split the conference too.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I am not very well acquainted with Mr. Dulles, but I am personally very well acquainted with Mr. Byrnes, and if Mr. Dulles is as good a man as Jim Byrnes I think the American Government is to be congratulated on having two such eminent men to represent them at the conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you are expressing an opinion now.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Rankin, your enthusiastic endorsement of Mr. Byrnes is the biggest condemnation in the eyes of the American people.

Mr. RANKIN. Thanks very much. Now, I want to ask you about what you said yesterday. If I understood you correctly you said the Soviet state is not a Communist state?

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is a Socialist state.

Mr. RANKIN. It started out as a Communist state, did it not?

Mr. FOSTER. No, it started out as a Socialist state. It started out as a capitalist state.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but when the revolution came on—I believe the Kerenski Revolution came first, and Lenin and Trotsky followed him. Didn't they set up a Communist Government, a Communist state?

Mr. FOSTER. No, there was a period during the Civil War in which they had what they called "War Communism." During periods of great crises people will have recourse to communism. Our forefather who landed on Plymouth Rock were Communists. It isn't widely advertised in our school books, but the system of society that they established in Massachusetts was a Communist society.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, you advocate a Communist state in this country, do you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Socialism. That is one of the things about these committees that we take violent exception to, because the committee does not present or allow us to present the program of the Communist Party. The Communist Party comes forward with a whole program of reform for the capitalist system, and 98 percent of our activities are precisely directed to this end. So far as socialism is concerned, socialism is a matter of educational work. Our practical activities have to do with wages and hours and working conditions and prices and reconversion and the rest of the problems that confront the nation.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that socialism, the Socialist Party, is represented by Mr. Norman Thomas. Now, you say you are the head or the leader of the Communist Party. You are in favor, then, as I understand it, not of the same kind of government that Mr. Thomas advocates, but you are in favor of a Communist state in America, in the United States? Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. I have said that time and time again. First of all, we are in favor of the best possible conditions under capitalism. We are in favor of socialism as a long run proposition, which the American people will finally find themselves compelled to adopt—that is, the majority of the American people. They will see the logic of the thing, and socialism is the first stage of communism.

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to say, I think I have read where you stated in a speech that socialism was merely a step towards communism. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the first stage of communism.

Mr. RANKIN. Then it gets more pronounced—the theory that you represent gets more pronounced as you progress from socialism toward communism?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right. As the prosperity of the people under socialism grows and the problem of production ceases to be a real problem, then they go over into communism. The fact of the matter is that the Soviet Government was already beginning to consider the problem of communism, that is, beginning to figure that now they have solved the problem of production to a very great extent, and they should begin to think about establishing communism.

Mr. RANKIN. Isn't it a fact that the Soviet Union is swinging toward capitalism now?

Mr. FOSTER. Nonsense.

Mr. RANKIN. You don't think so?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course not.

Mr. RANKIN. The Soviet Union has in the last year or two made several changes which indicates they are swinging towards capitalism, have they not?

Mr. FOSTER. That may be your opinion but it is not true.

Mr. RANKIN. So you think, then, that the Soviet Union is a Socialist state, and that would be a state in harmony with the views of Mr. Norman Thomas, as contrasted with the views of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. No, Mr. Norman Thomas is one of bitterest enemies of the Soviet Union in the United States. Mr. Norman Thomas is a red baiter. Mr. Norman Thomas sabotaged the war that we have just gone through, and considered the Soviet Union, not Hitler, as the main enemy. But Mr. Norman Thomas was not bothered for his sabotage of the war, but Communists who supported the war—and I mean supported the war—there was nobody in this country that gave this war more urgent and more complete support with such means as we had than we did, but we are haled before a tribunal like this and pillored all over the country as un-American.

Mr. LANDIS. You mean during the war, the war's entirety from start to finish?

Mr. FOSTER. The American participation—

Mr. LANDIS (interposing). You say the Communists before the war, from the beginning to the end? Is that right?

Mr. FOSTER. The American participation in the war, of course.

Mr. LANDIS. Did you disagree with Browder on strikes?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. LANDIS. Browder said there should be no strikes.

Mr. FOSTER. Right.

Mr. LANDIS. Did you agree with him on that?

Mr. FOSTER. 100 percent.

Mr. RANKIN. Did the Communist Party support the American Government at the time when Russia had a nonaggression pact with Germany?

Mr. FOSTER. A nonaggression pact with Germany? I thought we were past that.

Mr. RANKIN. No, that is my question.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought the American people had come to understand that this was one of the major reasons why we won the war, precisely that. This was the thing that enabled the Soviet Union to pull together its strength that made possible the defense before Moscow and the victory at Stalingrad.

Mr. RANKIN. Isn't it a fact—

Mr. FOSTER. (interposing). I think it is about time that you should know that. I think the historians of the war have generally agreed on that.

Mr. RANKIN. Isn't it a fact that during the time that Germany had that non-aggression pact with Russia, the Communists were picketing the White House in protest against our preparation for war and our furnishing supplies to England and France?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know whether they were Communists. I know some did.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, I noticed some Communists that were doing that picketing.

Mr. FOSTER. There was some organization. It was not our party.

Mr. RANKIN. That's all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You have defined, Mr. Foster, in your testimony heretofore, the fundamentals of the two parties, the Socialist Party and the Communist Party. I would like to inquire, if I may, whether or not, if you had the power to formulate a government of the United States, would you project into that government the principles that you have defined as being the principles of the Communist Party or the Socialist Party under the definition that you yourself gave? Which would you project into the picture?

Mr. FOSTER. We are realists, and we have to look at things as they are. Our party bases itself on the coalition of the democratic forces of the country, workers, farmers, and middle class elements, as I stated, the progressive-minded employers who may favor certain steps, and the thing that we would undertake to do first would be to make sure that there could be full employment in this country. That is what we would undertake.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not responsive to my question. I asked you what you would do?

Mr. FOSTER. At some remote period. That is another story.

The CHAIRMAN. Ultimately you would project into the government then the principles of communism?

Mr. FOSTER. Not necessarily we. By the time we would raise the question of socialism as a practical issue in America, that would signify that in our judgment the majority of the American people were convinced that they had to move in the direction of socialism, as is the case in England at the present time. When the question of socialism is raised, the majority of the English people support it. That is exactly the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question I asked you is based on the hypothesis that you yourself have the power to formulate the government.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have such power.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't know what you would do?

Mr. FOSTER. I stated what I would do.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to ask you just two or three questions anyway. Has there been any attempt by the organization that you head, or its responsible officers, to place in the public schools of this country, and particularly in some of the large cities like New York, teachers of Communist leanings?

Mr. FOSTER. You mean any special campaign?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. No, but we take the position that teachers are citizens like everybody else and they may hold such ideas as they believe in.

The CHAIRMAN. What I asked you was if there has been any special or concerted effort?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you familiar with a new school that has been set up in New York City, largely for veterans, known as the New School for Social Resources?

Mr. FOSTER. I know of it in a vague way.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know any of the members of the faculty of that school?

Mr. FOSTER. Not one.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't know any of them by name?

Mr. FOSTER. None of them. If I saw their names I might know them, but I could not say.

The CHAIRMAN. Of your knowledge, are there any members of the Communist Party who occupy positions of instruction in that school?

Mr. FOSTER. Not to my knowledge. I don't even know who they are, so I can't say.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

Mr. RANKIN. One more question. Yesterday, Mr. Foster, or a day or two ago, you were discussing this pamphlet I hold here, Syndicalism, that you wrote more than 30 years ago. You published that pamphlet up to about 1919 or 1920, did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. No, it was published in 1912 or thereabouts.

Mr. RANKIN. Isn't it a fact that it was being published in 1919 under your name?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it was published but not by me, not under my authorization.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, it had your name on it?

Mr. FOSTER. The steel trust published it. The steel trust undertook to red bait the steel workers strike, of which I was the head. We had 365,000 workers on strike. I was the organizer for the American Federation of Labor, and as reactionaries generally do, they figured that red baiting could help to break the strike. You raise the pamphlet now for this purpose of creating a red hysteria in the country. They raised it at that time in the hope of having some effect upon the steel workers. They published it and that's all. I had nothing whatever to do with it, no more than I have with you bringing it up now.

The CHAIRMAN. How many copies were published? Do you know?

Mr. FOSTER. I could not say, but I know their prospectus offered it in 25,000 lots and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. How many copies were published under your authority?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, very few. I could not say—it was so many years ago, but it was a very small number, perhaps five or ten thousand.

Mr. RANKIN. You said the other day you repudiated it when you joined the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. Even before that.

Mr. RANKIN. When did you join the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. In 1921.

Mr. RANKIN. You said yesterday, or the day before that you repudiated the pamphlet when you joined the Communist Party.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the fact of the matter is, I had to repudiate that pamphlet every time I met one of these committees.

Mr. RANKIN. That's all.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to raise one point. I would like to register a protest here. I am a citizen of New York, a citizen of New York City, and I want to protest against the meddling of this committee in the local elections in New York City.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, that is the usual Communist technique, the same old Communist technique, and it is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not interested in municipal elections.

Mr. FOSTER. I know it is hard to take but I think you should be good enough to let me talk.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment now. Your protest, of course, is noted.

Mr. FOSTER. But I haven't finished my protest. I think the people of New York are quite competent to decide who they want for councilman without the interference of this committee, and I am sure that when election comes along they will give this committee the answer that it deserves. I mean the summoning of Ben Davis, which was direct interference with the rights of voters.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment—since you brought the question up, you were not present when this happened, but because of the fact that Ben Davis, when he was subpoenaed before this committee, made the statement that he desired to be relieved from attending here until such time as the election was over, he was granted that privilege, and there has been no further interference with Ben Davis' activities as a candidate for office in New York City. He was not subpoenaed before this committee for any such purpose as that. So far as I know, there is not a member of this committee that has got the slightest interest on earth in the election in New York City, because no member of this committee is a resident of New York.

Mr. FOSTER. You didn't need to be kind to him. He can take care of himself.

The CHAIRMAN. He requested that he be excused, and the request was promptly granted.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, what do you suppose the New York Daily News said about this? What do you suppose the Hearst press said about it?

The CHAIRMAN. I am just answering your protest with that explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. They said that the action of this committee had this effect, and not only that, but I am convinced that that was the purpose of it.

Mr. LANDIS. He made the request and we granted it, so he ought to be satisfied.

Mr. MUNDT. One further question, Mr. Chairman. I don't like to admit it, but I am a little confused about the distinction between communism and socialism the way you have defined it. You have said that what they have in Russia is not communism but is socialism, and you said you thought they

were about ready now to take some steps toward communism in the Soviet Union?

Mr. FOSTER. They said that before the war.

Mr. MUNDT. Before the war?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Now, could you tell this committee what you envisage as those changes which will take place when that system evolves from socialism to communism? Maybe that will help us understand the difference.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know what particular steps they had in mind, so I don't know as I should undertake to say. It would be purely speculation on my part, but the general principle of the thing is that instead of measuring out people's remuneration according to the wage system, there would be more or less of a free distribution of commodities that were in sufficient abundance so that it was not necessary to measure them out; people would take what they need.

Mr. LANDIS. The real communist system, then, has never been tried out?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it has.

Mr. LANDIS. Where?

Mr. FOSTER. The Catholic Church was communist for 325 years, primitive communism we call it, for 325 years. Not only that, but we have had dozens of communist sects in this country, what we call "primitive communism," usually organized around some religious conception.

Mr. LANDIS. In this country?

Mr. FOSTER. In this country, yes, Quakers and Shakers and various groups.

Mr. MUNDT. I give up.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you some questions, Mr. Adamson?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I have got about 2 hours with Mr. Foster. This morning Mr. Foster reached some common ground with Mr. Murdock, who you will remember said if there was any foreign influence or control of a political organization he conceded that that was an un-American activity, and we are prepared to prove that, but we cannot do it today, and I should like to approve also the request for the attendance, at whatever date the committee sets, of Mr. Joseph R. Brodsky, and ask that he bring with him all the books, records, and papers of the Sound View Corporation. If Mr. Brodsky doesn't agree to that, of course I shall ask the chairman to issue a subpoena.

The CHAIRMAN. Now let me inquire of Mr. Foster—he has been detained here quite a little while longer than I anticipated when we asked you to come, would you mind giving to us some time in the future, probably some date next week, when you can come back for another day?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like a couple of weeks, if I might. I have a trip scheduled out West.

The CHAIRMAN. We will accommodate ourselves to your convenience and assure you that your expenses will be defrayed.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I write you, then, about the matter?

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. ADAMSON. How about a week from Thursday, 2 weeks from yesterday?

Mr. FOSTER. That would be too soon for me. How about the following Monday?

Mr. ADAMSON. How about the following Wednesday?

Mr. FOSTER. That will be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be 2 weeks from next Wednesday, Mr. Foster. That would be the 7th day of November.

Mr. ADAMSON. That will be the day after the election in New York City. Is it agreeable with Mr. Brodsky that he will appear without a subpoena?

Mr. BRODSKY. Any time you want.

Mr. ADAMSON. And bring the books and papers of the Sound View Corporation?

The CHAIRMAN. Let us make it Thursday, the 8th of November at 10 o'clock.

Mr. ADAMSON. Thursday, November 8th.

The CHAIRMAN. Until that time then you are excused, Mr. Foster.

Mr. RANKIN. At this point in the record, Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit the pamphlet entitled "Syndicalism", by William Z. Foster, extracts from which I have previously read.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Syndicalism

By Earl C. Ford
& Wm. Z. Foster



Price, 10 cents

Published by

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

1000 S. Paulina St., Chicago

INTRODUCTION

THE SITUATION—ITS CAUSE AND CURE

The American working man who arouses himself from the customary state of indifference characterizing workmen and gazes about him in a critical mood, must be struck by the great inequalities in the conditions of the beings surrounding him.

On the one hand, he sees vast masses of workers working long hours, often at most dangerous and unhealthy occupations, and getting in return hardly the scantiest of the necessities of life. He sees this starving, slaving mass of workers afflicted with the terrible social scourges of unemployment, crime, prostitution, lunacy, consumption, and all the other forms of social, mental and physical degeneracy which are the inseparable companions of poverty.

On the other hand, he sees a comparatively small number of idle rich revelling in all the luxuries that modern society can produce. Though they do nothing useful for society, society pours its vast treasures into their laps, and they squander this wealth in every way that their depraved and sated appetites can suggest. The monkey dinners, dog suppers, pig luncheons, hiring of noblemen for servants, buying of princes for husbands and cartloads of valuable art treasures for notoriety, and the thousand and one other insane methods of the American aristocracy to flaunt its wealth are too well known to need recapitulation here. Our observing worker must indeed conclude that something is radically wrong in a society that produces such extremes of poverty and wealth, and toil and idleness.

SOME FAKE CAUSES AND QUACK REMEDIES

His inquiries as to the cause of these inequalities are met by a shower of answers from retainers of the rich. He is told that they are due to the trusts, the tariff, to the fact that the workers don't "save," that they "drink," that they are unfit to survive in the great social struggle for the survival of the fittest from which the rich have emerged the victors, etc, etc. But even the slightest examination of these answers will show their superficiality and inability to explain the great inequalities in modern society.

Poverty with its terrible co-evils and wealth with its luxuries are not caused by the trusts or the tariff. They are to be found in all industrial countries alike, whether they have trusts and tariffs or not.

Neither are they caused by the workers "squandering" their wages in "drink" and the rich "saving up." A few years ago it was shown that the yearly wages of the anthracite coal miners amounted to \$40.00 less than the cost of the actual necessities of life. It has been recently calculated that the street railway workers of Chicago receive wages enough to buy only two-thirds of the necessities of life. The same is true, more or less, of every category of workers. Even if the workers spent not a cent for drink they couldn't "save," as they would still want for prime necessities. And even if a worker expended nothing of the two dollars per day average wages he received, and "saved" it all for 2,000 years, his savings at the end of that time would amount to but a fraction of the fabulous sums amassed by American multi-millionaires in a few years while revelling in luxury. To say that the workers are poor because they "drink" and don't "save" is absurd.

The argument that the rich are rich because they are capable and the poor are poor because they are incapable is belied everywhere. Thousands of wealthy stockholders are drawing dividends from industries they have never even seen—let alone to know anything of them or their operation. A goodly share of this interest-drawing aristocracy—if not the majority—is composed of perverts and mental degenerates of various types, such as the Thaw and McCormick heirs of malodorous renown. To say that these degenerates and the mediocre balance of the aristocracy occupy their present positions of affluence because of their superior capacities is to insult common intelligence.

THE TRUE CAUSE AND ITS CURE

The fallacies of the various other orthodox explanations for the social inequalities and their terrible effects will at once be apparent to the intelligent inquiring worker. He must seek deeper for the true explanation. He will find it in the wages system, which is the foundation institution of modern society.

The Wages System.—The means whereby society gains its livelihood: the shops, mills, mines, railroads, etc., are owned by the comparatively few individuals. The rest of society, in order to work in the industries and procure a living, must secure the permission of these individuals. As the number of applicants for jobs is far greater than the needs of the industries, there is such competition for the available positions that those who secure them are, in return for the privilege to earn a living, forced to give up to the owners of the industries the lion's share (in the United States four-fifths) of the abundant products the highly developed machinery enables them to produce. The owners of the industries take advantage of their strategic position and steal the greater portion of the workers' product, giving them, in the shape of wages, barely enough to live on.

The wages system of robbery is responsible for the great extremes of poverty and wealth to be found in modern society. It has existed ever since the very beginning of industrialism and its effects grow worse daily. Every invention of a labor-saving device, by increasing the army of the unemployed and making the competition for jobs keener, enables the owners of the industries to more thoroughly exploit their slaves. Thus the wages system has the effect of making inventions of labor-saving devices curses to the bulk of society, instead of blessings as they should be.

The Revolution.—The wages system is the most brazen and gigantic robbery ever perpetrated since the world began. So disastrous are its consequences on the vast armies of slaves within its toils that it is threatening the very existence of society. If society is even to be perpetuated—to say nothing of being organized upon an equitable basis—the wages system must be abolished. The thieves at present in control of the industries must be stripped of their booty, and society so reorganized that every individual shall have free access to the social means of production. This social reorganization will be a revolution. Only after such a revolution will the great inequalities of modern society disappear.

THE MEANS TO THE REVOLUTION

The Class Struggle.—For years progressive workers have realized the necessity for this revolution. They have also realized that it must be brought about by the workers themselves.

The wages system has divided the immense bulk of society into two classes—the capitalist class and the working class. The interests of these two classes are radically opposed to each other. It is the interest of the capitalist class to rob the workers of as much of their product as possible and the interest of the workers to prevent this robbery as far as they can. A guerilla warfare—known as the class struggle and evidenced by the many strikes, working class political eruptions and the many acts of oppression committed by capitalists upon their workers—constantly goes on between these opposing classes. The capitalists, who are heartlessness and cupidity personified, being the dominant class of society and the shapers of its institutions, have organized the whole fabric of society with a view to keeping the working class in slavery. It is, therefore, evident that if the workers are to become free it must be through their own efforts and directly against those of the capitalists. Hence the revolutionary slogan, "The emancipation of the workers must be wrought by the workers themselves."

Rejection of Political Action and Acceptance of Direct Action.—It goes without saying, that for the workers to overthrow capitalism they must be thoroughly organized to exert their combined might. Ever since the inception of the revolutionary idea the necessity for this organization has been realized by progressive workingmen and they have expended untold efforts to bring it about.

These efforts have been almost entirely directed into the building of working class political parties to capture the State—it being believed that with such a party in control of the State, the latter could be used to expropriate the capitalists. The Socialist parties in the various countries have been laboriously built with this idea in view. But of late years, among revolutionists, there has been a pronounced revolution against this program. Working class political action is rapidly coming to be recognized as even worse than useless. It is being superseded by the direct action¹ of the labor unions.

This rejection of political action and acceptance of direct action has been caused by the failure of the former and the success of the latter. Working class political

¹ This much-maligned term means simply the direct warfare—peaceful or violent, as the case may be—of the workers upon their employers, to the exclusion of all third parties, such as politicians, etc.

parties, in spite of the great efforts spent upon them, have been distinct failures, while, on the other hand, labor unions, though often despised and considered as interlopers by revolutionists, have been pronounced successes. For a long time, practically unnoticed, they went on all over the world winning the most substantial victories for the working class. It was only the continued failure of political action that led revolutionists to study them and to make a dispassionate comparison of their achievements, possibilities, structure, etc., with those of the working class political party. The result of this study is the growing rejection of political action and the rapid development of the revolutionary labor unions, or Syndicalist movement, which is attracting the attention of the whole world.

In the following pages the various phases of this new movement, designed to free the working class, will be discussed.

SYNDICALISM

I. THE GOAL OF SYNDICALISM²

The Syndicalist movement is a labor union movement, which, in addition to fighting the every-day battles of the working class, intends to overthrow capitalism and reorganize society in such a manner that exploitation of man by man through the wages system shall cease. The latter phase of this triple task—the establishment of a society worthy of the human race—is the real goal of Syndicalism and the end for which all its efforts are finally spent. Consequently, an understanding of the manner in which the new society shall be organized is a matter of first importance to Syndicalists and they have given it much thought.

THE OPERATION OF THE INDUSTRIES

Anti-Statism.—At this early date, though many of the minor details of the organization plan of the new society can only be guessed at, many of its larger outlines are fairly clear. One of these is that there will be no State. The Syndicalist sees in the State only an instrument of oppression and a bungling administrator of industry, and proposes to exclude it from the future society. He sees no need for any general supervising governmental body, and intends that the workers in each industry shall manage the affairs of their particular industry; the miners shall manage the mines; the railroaders manage the railroads, and so on through all the lines of human activity.

Current Syndicalist Theory.—Just how the workers shall be organized to manage their industries has been a matter of much speculation. The current Syndicalist theory is that the labor unions in the various industries will each take over the management of their particular industry; that "the fighting groups of today will be the producing and distributing groups of tomorrow."³

This theory, while based on the correct principles, that the State is incompetent to administer industry, and that the most competent bodies possible to do so are the workers actually engaged in the industries, is in all probability incorrect in itself. There are other organizations of workers, overlooked by the formulators of the above theory, that are far more competent to carry on industry than are the labor unions. These are the shop organizations of modern industry.

Shop Organizations.—By the shop organization of an industry is meant the producing organization of workers in that industry. It includes every worker in that industry, whatever his function may be. All industries, including the professions, etc., have such shop organizations more or less well developed. To carry on production of any kind without a shop organization is impossible.

The superiority of these shop organizations to the labor unions for the administration of industry is manifest. They have been especially constructed to carry on production in all its phases, and are daily doing so; while labor unions are simply fighting organizations of workers, knowing, as such, nothing about the operation of industry. These shop organizations will not perish with the fall of capitalism, but, barring some initial confusion, due to the revolution, will continue on in much their present shape into the future society. To try to replace these highly developed and especially constructed producing organizations by the labor unions—which have been built for an entirely different purpose—would be

² "Syndicalism" is the French term for labor unionism. It is derived from the word "syndicat," or local labor union. To distinguish themselves from conservative unionists, French rebel unionists call themselves revolutionary Syndicalists. The former are known as conservative Syndicalists. In foreign usage the French meaning of the term Syndicalism has been modified. It is applied solely to the revolutionary labor union movement.

³ C. G. T. convention, Amiens, 1906.

as foolish as unnecessary. There will be no need to change the "fighting groups of today into the producing and distributing groups of tomorrow." These producing and distributing organizations already exist. The labor unions will serve a very different purpose in the future society, as will be shown later.

Autonomy of Shop Organizations.—In the future society the shop organizations will be perfectly autonomous—each automatically regulating its own affairs and requiring no interference from without. The producing force of society will be composed of autonomous units—each industry constituting a unit. The beginnings of this industrial autonomy are seen in the more highly monopolized industries of today. These industries are becoming automatic in their operation. Chance and arbitrary industrial dictatorship are being eliminated from them. The whole industrial process is becoming a matter of obeying facts and figures. In a monopolized industry the national demand for its product flows inevitably to it and it regulates its production automatically to conform to this demand. In the future society all industries will be monopolized and each will regulate its production according to the demands placed upon it by the rest of society. The relations between the various industries will be simply the filling of each other's orders for commodities.⁴

This principle of autonomy will extend to the component parts of the various industries, as arbitrariness in an industry is as detrimental as between industries. This principle is also being more and more recognized and accepted in modern industry. The recent breaking up of the Harriman railroad system into five autonomous subsystems is proof of this.

As the activities of the autonomous shop organizations will extend over all social production, including education, medicine, criminology, etc., there will be no need for a general supervising body to administer industry—be it the State or the labor unions. And as there will be no slave class in society and no ownership in the social means of livelihood, the State will have lost the only other reasons for its existence—the keeping of the working class in subjection and the regulation of the quarrels between the owners of the industries.

Initiative.—The statist, while admitting, perhaps, that a certain amount of autonomy is necessary between the industries and also between their component parts, and that, to a certain extent, they will automatically regulate themselves, will, nevertheless, insist that very many instances occur in which these autonomous bodies are incapable of carrying on the multiple functions of society, and that they must submit to legislative bodies. He will pose the question of initiative: "Who, in the new society, will decide on the adoption of far-reaching measures, such as the creation of new industries, reorganizing of old ones, adoption of new industrial processes, etc., which will affect all society?" And he himself will quickly answer: "The majority of the representatives of all society in the government."

But this conclusion is entirely fallacious and at variance with the laws of modern production, as the following typical example, taken from modern industry, will show: Suppose steel costs \$10.00 per ton to produce and a new process is invented, by which steel can be produced for \$3.00 per ton. The question of the adoption of this new process—surely one affecting all society—is merely a question of whether or not it will pay interest on the cost of its installation. IT IS PURELY A MATTER OF FIGURES AND IS SETTLED IN THE STEEL INDUSTRY ALONE. SOCIETY AS A WHOLE IS NOT CONSULTED. THE STEEL INDUSTRY DICTATES TO THE REST OF SOCIETY IN MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE STEEL INDUSTRY. And this is perfectly logical, even from an idealist standpoint, as it is manifest that the workers in the steel industry are the most competent of all society to decide on matters relating to the steel industry.

There is nothing democratic in this procedure; but it is that of modern industry. And it has been so successful in the development of the industries under capitalism that it is very unlikely it will be changed in the future society. And why should it be? Suppose, for instance, the scientifically organized medical fraternity, from experience and figures at hand, decided that a certain hygienic measure, such, for example, as vaccination, to be necessary for society's welfare, would it be logical for a rational society to submit such a proposition to a referendum vote of a lot of shoemakers, steel workers, farmers, etc., who know nothing about it, or to a government of their representatives equally ignorant? Such a procedure would be ridiculous. Even under capitalism the incompetence of governments to decide such questions is being recognized, and the decisions of specialists of vari-

⁴ For the fundamental idea of this paragraph—the automatic operation of industry—the authors are indebted to J. A. Jones of New York.

ous kinds are being more and more taken as the basis of laws regulating their particular social functions. In the future society these decisions, coming from thoroughly organized specialists—doctors, educators, etc.—who then will have no interest to bilk their fellow beings, as they now have—will be the social laws themselves governing these matters, even as the decision of the steel industry is now social law in matters pertaining to the production of steel. This undemocratic principle will be applied to all the industries.

The fear that one industry might impose arbitrary measures upon the rest of society is groundless, as the same impulses for the improvement of the industries, though in a different form, will exit then, as now. In the unlikely event of such arbitrariness on the part of one industry, the use of direct action tactics on the part of the other industries would soon make it reasonable again.

Selection of Foremen, Superintendents, Etc.—In the future Syndicalist society the ordinarily unscientific custom of majority rule will be just about eliminated. It will be superseded by the rule of facts and figures. Not only will the industries be operated in the undemocratic manner above outlined; but, the responsible positions in them will be filled in a manner all at variance with democratic principles. The foremen, superintendents, etc., will be chosen on the score of their fitness; by examination, instead of on the score of their ability to secure the support of an ignorant majority, through their oratorical powers, good looks, influence, or what not, as is the ordinary democratic procedure. Syndicalism and democracy based on suffrage do not mix.

DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL PRODUCT

The question of the system for the division of the social product in the new society has not been the subject of much discussion by Syndicalists. However, they very generally accept the Anarchist formula: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs." They will abolish all ownership in the social means of livelihood and make them free for each to take what he needs.

They believe that when all are free to help themselves from the all-sufficing products of society they will no more misuse their opportunity than people now misuse the many enterprises under capitalism—streets, roads, bridges, libraries, parks, etc.—which are managed according to the Anarchistic principle of each taking what he needs. The prevailing code of ethics will prevent would-be idlers from taking advantage of this system.

Syndicalists generally repudiate the Socialist formula: "To each the full social value of his labor" and its accompanying wages system of labor checks. They assert, with justice, that it is impossible to determine the full value that individual workers give to society, and that if this is tried it will mean the perpetuation of social aristocracies.⁵

II. THE GENERAL STRIKE

Some Syndicalist Ethics.—The Syndicalist is characterized by the harmony that exists between his theories and his tactics. He realizes that the capitalist class is his mortal enemy, that it must be overthrown, the wages system abolished and the new society he has outlined established, if he is to live; and he is proceeding to the accomplishment of these tasks with unparalleled directness. He allows nothing to swerve him from his course and lead him in an indirection.

The Syndicalist knows that capitalism is organized robbery and he consistently considers and treats capitalists as thieves plying their trade. He knows they have no more "right" to the wealth they have amassed than a burglar has to his loot, and the idea of expropriating them without remuneration seems as natural to him as for the footpad's victim to take back his stolen property without paying the footpad for it. From long experience he has learned that the so-called legal and inalienable "rights" of man are but pretenses with which to deceive workingmen; that in reality "rights" are only enjoyed by those capable of enforcing them. He knows that in modern society, as in all ages, might is right, and that the capitalists hold the industries they have stolen and daily perpetrate the robbery of the wages system simply because

⁵ For fuller and very interesting details on a probable system of division of the social product, as well as that of the division of labor, in the future society, the student is recommended to read Kropotkin's "The Conquest of Bread," procurable from Mother Earth Publishing Co., 55 West Twenty-eighth Street, New York City. Price, \$1.00.

they have the economic power to do so. He has fathomed the current systems of ethics and morals, and knows them to be just so many auxiliaries to the capitalist class. Consequently, he has cast them aside and has placed his relations with the capitalists upon a basis of naked power.

In his choice of weapons to fight his capitalist enemies, the Syndicalist is no more careful to select those that are "fair," "just" or "civilized" than is a householder attacked in the night by a burglar. He knows he is engaged in a life and death struggle with an absolutely lawless and unscrupulous enemy, and considers his tactics only from the standpoint of their effectiveness. With him the end justifies the means. Whether his tactics be "legal" and "moral," or not, does not concern him, so long as they are effective. He knows that the laws, as well as the current code of morals, are made by his mortal enemies, and considers himself about as much bound by them as a householder would himself by regulations regarding burglary adopted by an association of house-breakers. Consequently, he ignores them insofar as he is able and it suits his purposes. He proposes to develop, regardless of capitalist conceptions of "legality," "fairness," "right," etc., a greater power than his capitalist enemies have; and then to wrest from them by force the industries they have stolen from him by force and duplicity, and to put an end forever to the wages system. He proposes to bring about the revolution by the general strike.

The General Strike Theory.—By the term "general strike," used in a revolutionary sense, is meant the period of more or less general cessation of labor by the workers, during which period, the workers by disorganizing the mechanism of capitalist society, will expose its weakness and their own strength; whereupon, perceiving themselves possessed of the power to do so, they will seize control of the social means of production and proceed to operate them in their own interest, instead of in the interest of a handful of parasites, as heretofore. The general strike is the first stage of the revolution proper.

There is nothing strained or abnormal in the general strike theory, neither in the supposition that the workers can so disorganize capitalist society as to be able to seize the industries, nor in the supposition that they will do so once they realize they have the power. Both conclusions flow naturally from the everyday experiences of the workers.

The power of the workers to disorganize and paralyze the delicately adjusted capitalist society and the inability of the capitalists to cope with this power are shown by every large strike conducted by modern methods. This has been even more clearly demonstrated than usual by the recent great strikes in England. The two-day strike of the railroaders paralyzed England, and the frantic capitalist class hastily brought it to a close. The recent strike of the coal miners was even more effective—the capitalists frankly acknowledging that England faced the most desperate situation in its whole career. If the English capitalist class was in such desperate straits during these strikes of single categories of conservative workers, what condition would it be in before a general strike of a revolutionary working class? It would be helpless and would have to accept any conditions the workers saw fit to impose upon it.

The everyday tactics of the workers strongly indicate the truth of the conclusion that they will expropriate the capitalists as soon as they learn they have the power to do so. In their daily strikes they pit their strength against that of their employers and wring from them whatever concessions they can. They don't remain long content with these concessions, and as soon as they are able they proceed to win more. They are insatiable, and, when the general strike proves their ability to do so, they will have no scruples against expropriating the capitalists. This expropriation will seem the more natural to them then, as they will be fortified by the Syndicalist conception that the capitalists are thieves and have no "right" to their property.

The partial strike of today, in which a comparatively few workers disorganize an industry and force concessions from their employers, is but a miniature of the general strike of the future, in which the whole working class will disorganize all the industries and force the whole capitalist class to give up its ownership of them.

The General Strike and the Armed Forces.—Once the general strike is in active operation, the greatest obstacle to its success will be the armed forces of capitalism—soldiers, police, detectives, etc. This formidable force will be used energetically by the capitalists to break the general strike. The Syndicalists have given much study to the problem presented by this force and have found the solution for it. Their proposed tactics are very different from those used by rebels in former revolutions. They are not going to mass themselves and

allow themselves to be slaughtered by capitalism's trained murderers in the orthodox way. Theirs is a safer, more effective and more modern method. They are going to defeat the armed forces by disorganizing and demoralizing them.

A fruitful source of this disorganization will be the extreme difficulty the armed forces will experience in securing supplies and transportation. Modern armies, to the effective, must have immense arsenals, powder works and other industrial establishments behind them to furnish them their supplies of ammunition, arms, food, and clothing. They also must have the railroads constantly at their disposal for transportation. When the general strike has halted these industries the army will be stricken with paralysis. Another source of disorganization will be the division of the armed forces into minute detachments to guard the many beleaguered gates of capitalism. The strikers, or revolutionists, will be everywhere, and will everywhere seize or disable whatever capitalist property they can lay their hands on. To protect this property the armed forces will have to be divided into a myriad of guards and scattered along the thousands of miles of railroads and around the many public buildings, bridges, factories, etc. The wealthy capitalists themselves will also need generous guards. The most important industries, such as transportation, mining, etc., will have to be operated in some manner. To do this will require many thousands more of soldiers and police.

The result will be that the armed forces will be minutely subdivided, and through the loss of the solidarity and discipline, from whence they derive their strength, they will cease to be a fighting organization. This will degenerate into a mass of armed individuals scattered far and wide over the country.⁶ These individuals can be easily overwhelmed and disarmed, or what is more likely, as they will be mostly workmen and in sympathy with the general strike, induced to join the ranks of their striking fellow workers. Once the disorganization of the armed forces is complete the revolutionists will seize the unprotected industries and proceed to reorganize society.

Syndicalists in every country are already actively preparing this disorganization of the armed forces by carrying on a double educational campaign amongst the workers. On the one hand, they are destroying their illusions about the sacredness of capitalist property and encouraging them to seize this property wherever they have the opportunity. On the other, they are teaching working class soldiers not to shoot their brothers and sisters who are in revolt, but, if need be, to shoot their own officers and to desert the army when the crucial moment arrives. This double propaganda of contempt for capitalist property "rights," and anti-militarism, are inseparable from the propagation of the general strike.⁷

OBJECTIONS

Preliminary Organization.—A favorite objection of the opponents of the general strike theory (mostly Socialists) is that the success of the general strike implies such a degree of preliminary organization and discipline on the part of the workers that, were they possessed of it, they wouldn't need to strike in order to enforce their demands.

Preliminary organization unquestionably aids very materially to the success of strikes, but all great strikes—which differ only in degree from the general strike—prove to us that this preliminary organization by no means has to be as thorough as the objectors insist. They show us that vast masses of unorganized workers can be readily provoked into revolt by the contagious example of a few, and, also, that these workers, once on strike, are in a few days easily and effectively organized—though for years previous untold efforts have been expended to organize them. They prove that, to a very large extent, great strikes break out spontaneously and, also, that they spontaneously produce the organization so essential to their success. The Lawrence strike of textile workers is a typical instance of a successful strike without preliminary organization. The 24,000 strikers, of twenty nationalities, at the opening of the strike had hardly a fragment of organization; a couple of weeks later they were thoroughly organized.

In all probability, the general strike, at least in its incipient stages, will follow the course that any number of modern great strikes have taken. Only a small

⁶ This is no far-fetched theory. It is justified by every modern great strike. The big French railroad strike of 1910 is typical. Thousands of soldiers were used as strike breakers, and thousands more scattered along the railroads to guard them. Many more were used, in ones and twos, to guard the bridges, public buildings, etc., in Paris and other cities.

⁷ The student is recommended to read Arnold Roller's excellent 10-cent pamphlet, "The Social General Strike," procurable from George Bauer, P. O. Box 1719, New York City.

part of the workers will be organized; this organized fraction, under some strong stimulus, will provoke a great strike, vast masses of unorganized workers, seeing an opportunity to better their conditions and caught in the general contagion of revolt, will join the strike, organizing themselves meanwhile; the strike will spread; society will be paralyzed, and the revolutionary workers, perceiving their power, will proceed to put an end to capitalism.

The success of the general strike does not necessitate the voluntary striking of every worker. Modern industry is so delicately adjusted, and the division of labor so complete, that if the bulk of the workers in a few of the so-called strategic industries—transportation, coal mining, steel making, etc.—quit work, the rest of the workers would be forced to do likewise through lack of materials and markets for their products. No doubt, the workers forced to quit thus, who would be mostly unorganized, unskilled, and the oppressed of the oppressed, would readily fall in with the program of the revolutionists once the general strike was well under way.

The objection that universal preliminary organization is necessary to the success of the general strike is a shallow one. It serves as a convenient excuse for designing politicians and labor leaders to keep labor unions from striking.

Starvation.—The general strike will not be broken by the workers being starved into submission, as is often objected. The general strike will be so devastating in its effects that it can last only a few days, during which period, if need be, the workers, accustomed as they are to starvation, and sustained by the enthusiasm of the revolution, could live on the most meager rations.* To get these rations, the Syndicalists intend to confiscate, as far as possible, all provisions found in the cities. They will also encourage the numerous poor farmers, tenants and agricultural wage workers to cast their fortunes with them, to revolt against the State, their landlords and employers, and to seize the land they occupy. Until production is normally resumed, the Syndicalists will trade to these farmers the amassed wealth of the cities for their foodstuffs. More than one revolution has been starved out by the farmers refusing to part with their products in exchange for worthless paper money. The Syndicalists have learned this lesson well and intend to give the farmers the substantial commodities they desire in exchange for their products. The army will be so busy protecting capitalist property and so permeated with rebellion that it will be at once incapable and unwilling to prevent this method of provisioning the revolution.

Bloodshed.—Another favorite objection of ultra-legal and peaceful Socialists is that the general strike would cause bloodshed.

This is probably true, as every great strike is accompanied by violence. Every forward pace humanity has taken has been gained at the cost of untold suffering and loss of life, and the accomplishment of the revolution will probably be no exception. But the prospect of bloodshed does not frighten the Syndicalist worker, as it does the parlor Socialist. He is too much accustomed to risking himself in the murderous industries and on the hellish battlefields in the niggardly service of his masters, to set much value on his life. He will gladly risk it once, if necessary, in his own behalf. He has no sentimental regards for what may happen to his enemies during the general strike. He leaves them to worry over that detail.

The Syndicalist knows that the general strike will be a success, and the timid fears of its opponents will never turn him from it, any more than will their arguments that it is an "illegal," "unfair" and "uncivilized" weapon.

III. THE DAILY WARFARE OF SYNDICALISM

The Partial Strike.—The Syndicalist is a possibilist. While attending the time he will be strong enough to dispossess his masters by the general strike, he carries on a continual guerrilla warfare with them, winning whatever concessions he can from them. In this daily warfare he uses a variety of tactics—chosen solely because of their effectiveness. Of these, the one most commonly used is the partial strike.

The Syndicalist is opposed, on principle, to the partial strike, as he would much rather settle with capitalism by the general strike. But realizing the impossibility of accomplishing the general strike at present, owing to the uneducated and unorganized state of the working class and knowing, also, that strikes offer the workers the best opportunities to secure this education and organization, he does the next best thing by provoking strikes wherever they have a reasonable chance for success. He makes these strikes as large, as revolutionary and as nearly approaching his general strike idea as possible.

The result of this policy is that in countries where the Syndicalist movement is strong strikes are taking on an extent and revolutionary character, and achieving a success unknown in countries with conservative labor movements. A typical instance of the success of Syndicalist tactics is seen in the case of the printers and building trades' laborers of Paris. The unskilled building trades laborers are Syndicalists, and use revolutionary tactics. The skilled printers are Socialists, and use conservative tactics. Result: "Three-fourths of the printers earn no more, perhaps less, than the building trades laborers."⁸ Of this success, Emile Vanderveld, a prominent Belgian Socialist, and, by no means, a friend of Syndicalism, was forced to admit in a recent address that the Syndicalist GCL (General Confederation of Labor) of France, with about 400,000 members, has accomplished more practical results than the numerically five times stronger Socialist unions of Germany.⁹

The Scab.—A large portion of the Syndicalists' success in their strikes is due to their energetic treatment of the strikebreaker. According to Syndicalist ethics, a poverty stricken workingman, in his predicament, can do anything save scab. He may beg, borrow, steal, starve or commit suicide, and still retain the friendship and esteem of his fellow workers; but, let him take the place of a striker and he immediately outlaws himself. He becomes so much vermin, to be ruthlessly exterminated. The French Syndicalists are especially merciless towards scabs. They are making strikebreaking such a dangerous profession that scabs are becoming pleasingly scarce and expensive. They literally hunt scabs as they would wild animals. This war on scabs is popularly known as "La chasse aux renards" (The fox chase).

Sabotage.—Next to the partial strike, the most effective weapon used by Syndicalists in their daily warfare on capitalism is sabotage.¹⁰ Sabotage is a very general term. It is used to describe all those tactics, save the boycott and the strike proper, which are used by workers to wring concessions from their employers by inflicting losses on them through the stopping or slowing down of industry, turning out of poor product, etc. These tactics, and consequently, the forms of sabotage, are very numerous. Many of them are closely related in character. Often two or more kinds of sabotage are used simultaneously or in conjunction with the strike.

Perhaps the most widely practiced form of sabotage is the restriction by the workers of their output. Disgruntled workers all over the world instinctively and continually practice this form of sabotage, which is often referred to as "soldiering." The English labor unions, by the establishment of maximum outputs for their member, are widely and successfully practicing it. It is a fruitful source of their strength.

The most widely known form of sabotage is that known as "putting the machinery on strike." The Syndicalist goes on strike to tie up industry. If his striking fails to do this, if strike breakers are secured to take his place, he accomplishes his purpose by "putting the machinery on strike" through temporarily disabling it. If he is a railroader he cuts wires, puts cement (in switches, signals, etc., runs locomotives into turntable pits, and tries in every possible way to temporarily disorganize the delicately adjusted railroad system. If he is a machinist or factory worker, and hasn't ready access to the machinery, he will hire out as a scab and surreptitiously put emery dust in the bearings of the machinery or otherwise disable it. Oftentimes he takes time by the forelock, and when going on strike "puts the machinery on strike" with him by hiding, stealing or destroying some small indispensable machine part which is difficult to replace. As is the case with all direct-action tactics, even conservative workers, when on strike, naturally practice this form of sabotage—though in a desultory and unorganized manner. This is seen in their common attacks on machines, such as street cars, automobiles, wagons, etc., manned by scabs.

Another kind of sabotage widely practiced by Syndicalists is the tactics of either ruining or turning out inferior products. Thus, by causing their em-

⁸ "La Vie Ouvriere," April 20, 1912, p. 110.

⁹ Pierre Ramus, "Generalstreik und Direkte Aktion," p. 26.

¹⁰ The term "sabotage" is derived from the old and widespread habit of oppressed and poorly paid workers, acting on the principle of "Poor work for poor wages," to deliberately lessen the quantity and quality of their products. This custom, which is the basic one of all sabotage, known in Scotland as "go canny," was described in France by the argot expression "travailler a coups de sabots." (Pouget, *Le Sabotage*, p. 3.) This may be freely translated "To work as one wearing wooden shoes;" that is, to work a little slower and more clumsy than one more favorably shod. It was from this argot expression that Emile Pouget, a prominent Syndicalist, derived and coined the word "sabotage" (literally "wooden shoeage"), now in universal use amongst Syndicalists.

ployers financial losses, they force them to grant their demands. The numerous varieties of this kind of sabotage are known by various terms, such as "passive resistance," "obstructionism," "pearled strike," "strike of the crossed arms," etc.

The French railroad strike of 1910 offers a fine example of this type of sabotage. The strike was lost and 3,300 men were discharged because of it. As a protest against this wholesale discharge, an extensive campaign of passive resistance on the railroads was started. The workers worked, but only for the purpose of confusing the railroad system. In the freight sheds shipments of glass were laid flat and heavy boxes piled upon them; "this side up with care" shipments were turned wrong side up; fragile and valuable articles were "accidentally" broken; perishable goods were buried and "lost," or ruined by being placed close to other shipments, such as oils and acids, that spoiled them. Also a complete confusion was caused by the deliberate mixture and missending of shipments. On the roads engines broke down or "died" unaccountably; wires were cut; engines "accidentally" dumped into turntable pits; passenger train schedules were given up, trains arriving and departing haphazard. But the worst confusion came from the missending of cars. Thousands of cars were hauled all over France in a haphazard manner. For instance, the billing of a car of perishable goods intended for the north of France would be so manipulated that the car would be sent to the south of France and probably "lost." At a place just outside of Paris there were, at one time, 1,800 of such "lost" cars—many of them loaded with perishable freight, consigned to no one knew whom. The most ridiculous "accidents" and "mistakes" continually occurred—for this is the humorous form of sabotage. To cite a typical instance: Army officials in one town received notice of the arrival of a carload of dynamite for them. They sent a large detachment of soldiers to convey it through the town. On arrival at its destination the supposed carload of dynamite turned out to be a "lost" shipment of potatoes.

As a result of this pearled strike the railroads had to employ thousands of additional employes in a fruitless attempt to straighten out the ridiculous tangle. They eventually had to reemploy the discharged workers.

The Italian railroads, several years ago, were completely demoralized by a campaign of obstructionism waged by their employes. By the workers simply living up to the letter of the regulations of the companies—which were similar to those in force on all railroads, but which are generally ignored by workers for the sake of expediency—they made it impossible to further operate the railroads until their demands were granted.

For several years the building trades workers of Paris have extensively practiced this form of sabotage. By systematically working slow and clumsy and deliberately spoiling their work and building material, they have demoralized the building industry. The building contractors are unable to cope with these insidious tactics. In 1910 they called a mass meeting of 30,000 capitalists, landlords, and architects to devise ways and means to combat them.

This meeting, which, by the way, failed to discover the sabotage antitoxin, was an eloquent testimonial to the effectiveness of sabotage. It is doubtful if any such meeting has ever been necessary to combat strikes, however extensive they may have been. Indeed sabotage has proven so successful that there are many who believe it will finally supersede the strike entirely. In France, so great is the fear of the masters of sabotage, that rebel public speakers refer to it only under danger of long imprisonment. This fear is by no means confined to France. The mere threat of the striking textile workers of Lawrence to sabotage their machinery and product in case they were forced back to work was a powerful deterrent to prevent their masters from breaking their strike. These scared individuals admitted that there are 1,000 ways in which rebellious workers can spoil cloth without fear of detection.

"Badigeonage" (literally, stone colorage) is another variety of sabotage that has been effectively used. The barbers of Paris forced their employers to grant them their demands by throwing eggs filled with acid against the painted fronts of the barber shops, which, after such treatment, had to be repainted. Of the 2,300 barber shops in Paris 2,000 were subjected to this treatment from 1902 to 1906, while the "badigeonage" campaign lasted.

"La bouche ouverte" (the open mouth) is another type of sabotage often used. By "la bouche ouverte" workers financially hurt their employers by telling the latter's customers of the deceptions practiced upon them. Building trades workers tell building inspectors and architects of poor material used and cause it to be condemned and the work to be done over again, striking waiters expose the filthiness of the restaurants, etc.

Workers engaged in selling their masters' wares directly to the public have effective, even though unnamed, methods of sabotage: The waiter gives extra large portions of food to his customers and undercharges them for it. The drug clerk gives generously of pure drugs, instead of adulterated ones, as he is supposed to. The grocer's clerk forgets to charge for all the articles he has sold, etc.

The various kinds of sabotage are applied singly or collectively, just as circumstances dictate. Some kinds can be used in one industry that cannot be used in another. There are but few industries, however, that cannot be sabotaged in one way or another.

Fundamental Principle of Sabotage.—Sabotage has been grossly misrepresented by those interested in fighting it. It has been alleged that saboters put strychnine and other poisonous stuffs in food; wreck passenger trains, and otherwise injure the public. These allegations are without foundation, as it is the first principle of working class sabotage that it be directed against the masters' pocketbooks. Practices tending to injure the public, or secure its ill will, are tabooed. The syndicalists leave it to their masters to jeopardize the public's safety through their adulteration of food, sabotaging of safety appliances, etc.

Weapon of Minority.—Sabotage is peculiarly a weapon of the rebel minority. Its successful application, unlike the strike, does not require the cooperation of all the workers interested. A few rebels can, undetected, sabotage and demoralize an industry and force the weak or timid majority to share in its benefits. The syndicalists are not concerned that the methods of sabotage may be "underhanded" or "unmanly." They are very successful and that is all they ask of them. They scoff at the sentimental objection that sabotage destroys the workers pride in his work. They prefer to be able to more successfully fight their oppressors, rather than to cater to any false sense of pride.

Nco-Malthusianism.—The syndicalist is a "race suicider." He knows that children are a detriment to him in his daily struggles, and that by rearing them he is at once tying a millstone about his neck and furnishing a new supply of slaves to capitalism. He, therefore, refuses to commit this double error and carries on an extensive campaign to limit births among workers. He has been a powerful factor in reducing births in France, which, according to recent statistics, are annually 35,000 less than the deaths. He is turned from his course neither by the inspired warnings of physicians nor the paid appeals of patriots. He has no race pride and but little fear. He sees in "race suicide" an effective method of fighting his masters, therefore he uses it.

Another interesting and effective syndicalist method of solving the child problem is to send strikers' children to surrounding districts, where they are taken care of by other workers until the strike is over. These tactics have been used with telling effect time and again.

The syndicalist is as "unscrupulous" in his choice of weapons to fight his everyday battles as for his final struggle with capitalism. He allows no consideration of "legality," "religion," "patriotism," "honor," "duty," etc., to stand in the way of his adoption of effective tactics. The only sentiment he knows is loyalty to the interests of the working class. He is in utter revolt against capitalism in all its phases. His lawless course often lands him in jail, but he is so fired by revolutionary enthusiasm that jails, or even death, have no terrors for him. He glories in martyrdom, consoling himself with the knowledge that he is a terror to his enemies, and that his movement, today sending chills along the spine of international capitalism, tomorrow will put an end to this monstrosity.

IV. SYNDICALISM AND POLITICAL ACTION ¹¹

Syndicalism is a revolutionary labor union movement and philosophy calculated to answer all the needs of the working class in its daily struggles, in the revolution, and in the organization of the new society. It rejects entirely and bitterly opposes the working class political movement—whose chief representative is the international Socialist Party—which has set the same task for itself.

Syndicalism's rejection of political action and opposition to the Socialist movement are due to: (1) the superiority of direct action to political action; (2) that the Syndicalist and Socialist movements are rivals and cannot cooperate.

¹¹ In this pamphlet the term "political action" is used in its ordinary and correct sense. Parliamentary action resulting from the exercise of the franchise is political action. Parliamentary action caused by the influence of direct action tactics, such as the passage of the minimum wage bill in England during the recent coal strike, is not political action. It is simply a registration of direct action.

(1) SUPERIORITY OF DIRECT ACTION

Achievements of Direct Action and Political Action.—The superiority of direct action to political action in winning concessions from capitalism is clearly seen in a comparison of the achievements to date of the direct action and political action movements.

All over the world practically all substantial concessions, such as shortening of the working day, increases of wages, protection in industry, etc., wrung by the workers from their masters, have been won through the medium of the labor unions. The political parties, on the other hand, have accomplished practically nothing for the working class. Karl Kautsky, a prominent Socialist writer, writing of what the workers have accomplished by political action in Germany—where they have by far the largest political party in the country—says:—

"The period of rapid change after the fall of Bismarck brought some little progress in Germany and France. In 1891 was enacted the law which established for women—who until then were unprotected—the eleven-hour maximum workday. In 1892 this regulation was also introduced in France.

"That was all! Since then no progress worthy of the name has been achieved. In Germany we have, in the entire seventeen years, come so far that just now the ten-hour workday for women has been established. The male workers yet remain fully unprotected. On the field of protection for male workers, as well as those of all other social reforms, complete stagnation reigns."¹²

This is the proud seventeen-year record of the great German Socialist Party, which has absorbed untold efforts of German revolutionists. Its previous twenty-five years of history are even still more barren of results. Compared to the achievements of the German labor unions, which, by no means, use modern tactics, the petty conquests of the Socialist Party dwindle into insignificance. The labor unions, though considered of minor importance and neglected, and even opposed, by the political leaders of the German working class, have in all cases secured great advances in wages, shortening of the workday, and other important benefits, too numerous to mention, for their members. Had the workers composing them been without labor unions and dependent solely upon the Socialist Party to defend their interests, they would have been reduced to a condition of serfdom.

The same political stagnation that Kautsky complains of in Germany exists in every capitalist country. This is especially true of the United States, where the workers, in spite of their continual dabbling in politics, have gained practically nothing by political action. Wherever they enjoy higher standards of living, safeguards in industry, etc., these are directly traceable to their labor unions. Unorganized workers are ordinarily wretched slaves suffering the lowest standard of living, the greatest exploitation and exposure to danger in industry. They lead a mere animal existence and are a fair example of what workers of all kinds would be were they destitute of labor unions.¹³

Reasons for Superiority of Direct Action.—The chief cause for the greater success of the labor unions than the political party is found in the superior efficacy of direct action to political action. The former is a demonstration of real power, the latter merely an expression of public sentiment. A couple of instances, taken from late labor history, will illustrate this point:

During the recent Lawrence textile strike, 24,000 workers, in the course of a couple of months, won important concessions in wages and improved working conditions, not only for themselves, but also for some 350,000 other workers in the same industry who took no part in the strike. In England, 1,000,000 coal miners, during their recent short strike, forced the British government to adopt the so-called "revolutionary" minimum wage bill. This strike shattered the long-accepted doctrine of the irresponsible relations between employer and employed in England. It is now coming to be a recognized principle that the workers have a right to a living wage at least.

For either of these groups of workers to have secured the same ends by political action would have been next to impossible. Of themselves alone they never could have done so, as minorities are negligible quantities in politics. To have accomplished even the preliminary steps to such victories they would have had to secure the political support of practically the whole working class.

¹² Kautsky, "Der Weg zur Macht," p. 77.

¹³ An early German political argument against the labor unions was that they were relics of the old guilds, and that the workers composing them were the most reactionary of the working class.

Even then they would have had no guarantee that their efforts had not all been in vain, as the financial powers—who are only to be coerced by demonstrations of force—have time and again flagrantly disobeyed the political mandates of the working class. The many working class laws declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court and the hundreds of “dead letter” laws on the statute books of the various states are sufficient proofs of the masters’ contempt for working class political action. It is to be remarked that the Supreme Court hasn’t the power to declare unconstitutional the eight-hour day, improved working conditions, or any other concessions won by direct action, even though they have been won by the most insignificant minority of workers. This is an eloquent testimonial to the efficacy of direct action.

Another tribute to the value of direct action—next in importance to the growth of the Syndicalist movement itself—is the growing tendency of Socialist politicians to recognize and concede functions to the labor unions. At first these politicians could see no good whatever in the labor unions and openly fought them.* However, little by little, they have had to, at least partially, recognize their worth and to quit their open warfare upon them, until now they have been universally forced to assign to them the task of maintaining the standard of living of the workers under capitalism. Many European Socialists even advocate winning the universal franchise by the general strike, which they have vainly tried to win by political action. The Belgian Socialist Party took this humiliating stand at its last convention.

Another cause of the inferior achievements of working class political action is that the Socialist Party does not take advantage of even the slight opportunities it has to help the workers. The Socialist Party, all over the world, unlike the labor unions, which are composed solely of workers with common economic interests, is composed of individuals of all classes—however conflicting their interests may be. It necessarily organizes on the basis of political opinion, not economic interests. The nonworking class elements control it everywhere and inject themselves into whatever offices the party wins. Once in office these ambitious politicians fritter away their time with various vote-catching schemes, such as the reduction of taxes, “clean government,” “social peace,” etc., while the working class is starving. They neglect to exploit even the few opportunities political action offers to improve the conditions of the working class.

Political Action as a Revolutionary Weapon.—In addition to being superior to the political party in accomplishments to date, the labor unions are also manifestly superior as the means to bring about the revolution.

Socialists, from time to time, have endorsed several theories for the expropriation of the capitalist class. The founders of Socialism, under the influence of the French revolutions, believed that the workers would violently seize control of the government and expropriate the capitalists. This theory was almost universally held by Socialists until the military systems in Europe reached the point of development where a mere fraction of the people, in the army, could defeat the balance in open warfare.¹⁴ It was succeeded by the ridiculous make-shift theory that the workers, after capturing the government by the ballot, will peacefully vote the capitalists’ expropriation—the latter being supposed to stand unresistingly by while their property is being “legally” taken away from them. This absurd notion is in turn being supplanted by the theory that the workers, after getting control of the government, will buy the industries from their present owners. Modern Socialists, with but few exceptions, generally indorse one or the other of these two latter theories. We will consider them in turn.

Confiscation Without Remuneration.—Forty-three years ago, Liebknecht, who believed “the social question a question of power, and, like all questions of power, to be settled on the streets and battlefields,” disposed of those dreamers who supposed the capitalists will allow their property to be voted away from them. In his pamphlet “Die politische Stellung der Sozialdemokratie, etc., amongst other gems he has the following: “However, let it be accepted that the government makes no use of its power, and, as is the dream of some Socialistic ‘phantasy politicians,’ a Socialist majority of the Reichstag is secured—what would this majority do? Hic rhodus hic salta. This is the moment to revolutionize society and the State. The majority passes a ‘world’s historical’ law, the new era is born—alas, no; a company of soldiers chase the Socialists out of the temple. And, if the gentlemen don’t submit to this calmly, a couple” of policemen will

¹⁴ The failure of the Paris Commune was another factor in the rejection of this theory. (See chapter VII.)

escort them to the city jail, where they will have time to think over their quixotic project."

Since Liebknecht wrote the above the developments have all been such as to render it still more unlikely that the capitalists can be "legally" expropriated without remuneration. Not only has the Socialist Party become so conservative that it is inconceivable that it could ever rise to the revolutionary heights of Liebknecht's supposed parliamentary majority, but even representative government itself is, as far as the workers are concerned, obsolete. The great capitalist interests have corrupted it root and branch. They buy wholesale whatever legislators, judges, etc., they need, just as they buy other commodities necessary in their industries.¹⁵ If the puppet government, for some reason or other, does anything contrary to their wishes, they either coerce it into reasonableness again or calmly ignore it. To suppose that this lickspittle institution, and especially under the stimulus of the Socialists, can ever forcibly expropriate the capitalists, is absurd.

Confiscation With Remuneration.—The Socialist plan of buying the industries is also a dream. The capitalists will never voluntarily sell the industries that lay them their golden eggs. If they do dispose of them to the State it will only be because the new financial arrangements suit them better. The inherently weak State can never force them to make a bargain unfavorable to themselves. To do this will require power, and this power lies alone in direct action.

But it is idle to even speculate on the aroused workers cowardly stooping to try to buy back the industries stolen from them. When the psychological moment arrives, the working class, hungering for emancipation, will adopt the only method at its disposal and put an end to capitalism with the general strike, as outlined in a previous chapter.

Thus, in both achievements to date and in promise for the future, direct action is far superior to political action. The political party has accomplished almost nothing in the past and offers even less promise for the future; whereas the labor union has won practically all the conquests of the workers in the past and also offers them the only means to the revolution.

(2) RIVALRY BETWEEN SYNDICALIST AND SOCIALIST MOVEMENTS

The Syndicalist movement does not co-operate with, but, on the contrary, opposes the Socialist movement, because, from long experience, it has learned that the two movements are rivals to each other and cannot co-operate together. This rivalry flows naturally from the conflicting theories upon which the two movements are built.

The Socialist "Two Wings" Theory.—According to this universal Socialist theory the many problems faced by the working class in its battle for industrial freedom are of two distinct and separate kinds, viz., political and economic. It is asserted that these questions are so fundamentally different that two distinct organizations must be built to solve them; one, the Socialist Party, to operate solely in the political "field," and the other, the labor unions, to operate solely on the economic "field." The two "wings" of the labor movement are thus to complement each other, each devoting itself to its peculiar problems.

According to this theory the Socialist Party is by far the most important organization of the two, as the political questions, over whose solution it has sole jurisdiction, are much more numerous and important than the economic questions under the jurisdiction of the labor unions. Indeed, according to it, the labor unions are merely auxiliaries to the political party in its great work of the emancipation of the working class. Their chief functions are to hold up the standard of living of the workers¹⁶ "to mitigate, as far as possible, the ravages of capitalism" by acting as benefit associations, and to serve as voting machines until the political party shall have overthrown capitalism.

The Syndicalist Theory.—The Syndicalists quarrel violently with the "two wings" theory, which gives to the labor unions functions of minor importance.

¹⁵ The much-heralded custom of demanding signed resignations from Socialist candidates for office has proven a distinct failure in keeping Socialist office holders free from this universal corruption, which implies nothing short of the bankruptcy of representative government.

¹⁶ This niggardly concession was made to the labor unions by the politicians only when it could be no longer withheld.

They maintain that there is but one kind of industrial question—the economic—and that but one working class organization—the labor unions—is necessary. They assert that the so-called political “field” does not exist and that the Socialist Party is a usurper. They have proven time and again that they can solve the many so-called political questions by direct action. By strikes, sabotage, etc., they force governments to take swift action on old age pensions, minimum wages, militarism, international relations, child labor, sanitation of workshops, mines, etc., and many other questions supposedly under the natural jurisdiction of the Socialist Party. And, as has been pointed out, the Syndicalists have no need for the Socialist Party, neither in the accomplishment of the revolution nor in the organization of the new society—the labor unions also sufficing for these tasks. The Syndicalists insist that the labor unions alone represent the interests of the working class and that the Socialist Party is an interloper and a parasite.¹⁷

THE WAR BETWEEN SYNDICALISTS AND SOCIALISTS

The result of these opposing conceptions of the functions of the labor union is a world-wide fight between political and direct actionists for the control of the labor union movement. Both are endeavoring to model it according to their theories. The Socialists are trying to subordinate it to the Socialist Party and the Syndicalists are bitterly contesting this attempt and trying to give the labor union its full development.

Causes of the War.—The fight between the Syndicalists and Socialists is inevitable. On the one hand, the Syndicalists, believing in the all-sufficiency of the labor union, naturally resist all Socialist attempts to limit its functions, while, on the other hand, the Socialists, for the sake of their party, are forced to combat the encroachments of the labor union. This latter statement admits of easy explanation. The first consideration for the success of the Socialist program is the capture of the State by the Socialist Party. To do this requires the support of practically the entire working class. Logically, any influence tending to alienate any of this support is an enemy to the Socialist Party and is treated as such. Everyday experience teaches that revolutionary labor unions, by winning great concessions for their members, by successfully operating in the so-called political “field,” and by carrying on an incessant anti-political campaign—which is inevitable if a union is to escape the political apron strings and take vigorous action—have a decided tendency to make these workers slight, or even reject entirely, the much-promising but little-accomplishing Socialist Party.

The Socialists have noted this and correctly view the Syndicalist movement—even as the Syndicalists do the Socialist movement—as a rival to their own. They recognize that every great victory it wins pulls working class support from their party and is a defeat for their movement, and that every defeat the Syndicalist movement suffers, by driving workers back to the Socialist Party, is a victory for the latter. They know that the Syndicalist and Socialist movements, both claiming jurisdiction over the whole working class, cannot exist in harmony. Hence, they logically fight the Syndicalist movement and attempt to subordinate the labor unions to the Socialist Party. In their efforts to conserve the interests of the Socialist Party they even go so far as to deliberately break strikes, and thus compromise the interests of the working class. Modern labor history is full of such instances. To cite but a few:

Socialist Treachery.—In 1904-6 the French labor unions, in the face of strong Socialist opposition, carried on a vigorous national propaganda for a universal eight-hour day, to take effect May 1, 1906. As the appointed day approached an epidemic of strikes broke out all over France and a revolution seemed imminent. At this critical juncture, the Socialist journal “*Le Reveil du Nord*” “discovered” that the whole movement was a conspiracy to overthrow the republic and re-establish the monarchy. The government, using the supposed conspiracy as a pretext, threw some 50,000 troops into Paris and many of the strike leaders into jail. This action, coupled with the evil effect on the workers of such a statement coming from so-called revolutionists, unquestionably did much to detract from the success of the movement.¹⁸

¹⁷ The same attitude obtains towards all other so-called working class political parties.

¹⁸ Krietsky, “*L'Evolution du Syndicalisme en France*,” p. 359-370.

¹⁹ The immense labor unions of Germany, which are controlled by the Socialists, are fair types of Socialist unions. They seldom strike, and never use modern tactics. Possessed of the latent power to overthrow capitalism they content themselves with serving as voting machines and mutual benefit societies.

In 1910, the French railroad unions declared a national general strike on all the railroads in France. The Socialists, fearing the consequences to their political party of such a great direct-action victory as this strike promised to be, deliberately broke the strike by keeping at work the railroaders on the strategic East R. R., whose unions they dominated. This road, the most strongly organized in France, at the behest of the notorious Socialist Prime Minister Briand, hauled scabs and soldiers to break the strike. The failure of the East R. R. to strike threw confusion into the ranks of strikers and the strike was almost completely lost. It was, though a wonderful exhibition of the power of direct action, in many respects a great Syndicalist defeat, and, consequently, indirectly, a great Socialist victory.

Arnold Roller, in his pamphlet, "The Social General Strike," cites many similar instances of Socialist betrayal of working class interests. To quote but one:—

"In February, 1902, the proletariat of Barcelona rose under the call of the general strike and was able to resist the police and army for a whole week. Pablo Iglesias, the leader of the Spanish Social Democracy, requested his followers everywhere to act as strike breakers and denunciators of the general strike. In some districts the Socialists even went so far as to send, during the general strike struggle, deputations to the government to announce their loyalty and to assure them that they, as law-abiding citizens, had nothing to do with the 'revolt.'"

The Campaign Against Direct Action.—In addition to fighting Syndicalism by breaking revolutionary strikes, Socialists universally combat it by carrying on a continual warfare upon it in all its manifestations, both in and out of the unions. Indeed, it is one of the regular functions of Socialist politicians to drug labor unions into quietude by telling the workers by word and pen what cannot be done by direct action.¹⁰

The Socialists are naturally inveterate enemies of the general strike—the general strike many of them favor as the means to the conquest of the universal suffrage is distinctly understood to be very different to the general strike of the Syndicalists; it is an auxiliary to political action, not a substitute for it—and they have even forbidden the discussion of it in the German labor unions. They are also rabid opponents of sabotage. Pouget, in "Le Sabotage," says that in the C. G. T. conventions in France the number of Socialist delegates present could always be determined by the vote against sabotage as a working class weapon. As its last convention the American Socialist Party showed itself "true to name" by adopting a resolution recommending the expulsion of all party members advocating the use of sabotage.

Retaliation by Syndicalists and Some Consequences.—The Syndicalists are not tamely submitting to these attacks from the Socialists but are vigorously resisting them. Their opposition is carried on chiefly by a campaign of anti-parliamentarism, by abstinence from voting and by getting control of the labor unions and plainly showing them to be more effective organizations than the Socialist Party.

In France, where the Syndicalists have secured almost complete control of the labor unions, they have clearly shown the inherent conflict of jurisdiction between the Syndicalist and Socialist movements, and the necessity for the subjugation of the former to the latter if they are to co-operate together. A couple of years ago the Socialist Party had an old-age pension bill (popularly known as "Viviani's old-age pensions for the dead") enacted. The C. G. T., the French general labor organization, condemned the law and decided to resist its enforcement by all the means at its disposal. In the resultant attempt of the government to force the law upon the unwilling workers the Socialist Party openly allied itself with the government against the C. G. T.

This incident made it clear that if the labor movement is to be spared the humiliation of having one of its "wings" fighting against what the other one has fought for, either the labor unions must be subordinated to the Socialist Party and forced to unquestioningly accept whatever doubtful bargains it makes, or the Socialist Party must go out of existence.

"The Nigger in the Woodpile."—This unseemly warfare between the two "wings" of the labor movement may seem incomprehensible to the novice. He may ask: "If the two movements are incompatible, and if the Syndicalist movement has proven itself so far superior to the Socialist movement, why isn't the Socialist Party given up and the labor unions developed?" The explanation is simple: Though there are undoubtedly many sincere workers who honestly believe in the superiority of political action to direct action, and who are conscientiously active in the upbuilding of the Socialist Party, they are but a minor

factor in the latter's constant betrayal of the interests of the workers. This is natural, as it is incomprehensible that rebel workers would deliberately betray their own interests for the sake of an organization that wins them nothing. The real force behind the Socialist war on Syndicalism is the horde of doctors, lawyers, preachers and other non-working class elements universally infesting and controlling the Socialist Party. These elements, who have no economic interests in common with the workers, see in the working class revolt simply a fine opportunity to worm themselves into the innumerable rich places of power and affluence in the State. Consequently they defend, by sophistry and treachery to the working class, the political movement necessary to their conquest of the State.

The prosaic, but aspiring, Syndicalist movement, with its few miserable official positions—the C. G. T. of France has but three regularly paid officials at \$50.00 per month each—which are, moreover, often fraught with great personal danger of imprisonment, has no attractions for the ambitious politicians. The fact that it is more effective in defending the interests of the working class than is the Socialist Party is of no moment to them. It doesn't "pay" as good as the Socialist Party, and, as it is a competitor of the latter, it must be suppressed.

Harmonizers of Socialism and Syndicalism.—There is a group of Socialists in the United States who are attempting to harmonize the Socialist political movement and the revolutionary direct-action movement on a somewhat original theory. They would have the labor movement consist of revolutionary labor unions on the one hand, and the Socialist Party on the other. The labor unions would be the superior organization, the Socialist Party being a sort of helper to them. The functions of the Socialist Party are described by Wm. D. Haywood and Frank Bohn in their pamphlet, "Industrial Socialism," p. 54: "The great purpose of the Socialist Party is to seize the powers of government and thus prevent them from being used by the capitalists against the workers. With Socialists in political offices the workers can strike and not be shot. They can picket shops and not be arrested and imprisoned. Freedom of speech and of the press, now often abolished by the tyrannical capitalists, will be secured to the working class. Then they can continue the shop organization and the education of the workers. To win the demands made on the industrial field it is absolutely necessary to control the government, as experience shows strikes to have been lost through the interference of courts and militia."

At first glance this plan of capturing the State solely for the purpose of preventing the use of the courts and armed forces against the workers seems plausible, but experience has shown it to be impracticable. As pointed out earlier, to carry out any national political program involves the construction of a great political organization. This, as has been time and again demonstrated, the workers refuse to do unless it can win important concessions for them—which is impossible—or the workers have not yet learned the value of direct action—which condition the Industrial Socialists by no means desire. Let the workers once get this knowledge—as Haywood and Bohn would have them—and they will build up their labor unions and desert the barren Socialist Party. They will also be inevitably forced to fight the latter in defending their unions from the attacks of the designing Socialist politicians, who will strenuously resist all attempts to strip their party of power or prestige. Vague expectations of one day being able to use the armed forces in their own interests—expectations which have been sadly disappointed wherever Socialists have gotten into power—will never prove a sufficient incentive to make the direct actionists perform the huge, if not impossible, task of purging the Socialist Party of its non-working class elements and building up the political organization necessary to capture the State. An organization which, moreover, would be cursed with all the weaknesses of parliamentarism and, consequently, foredoomed to failure.

OTHER POINTS OF CONFLICT BETWEEN SYNDICALISM AND SOCIALISM

Besides the inherent and incurable jurisdictional quarrel between the Syndicalist and Socialist movements there are numerous other matters over which they are in direct conflict. A few of these will be discussed:

Society.—A fundamental point of conflict between Syndicalists and Socialists is their respective attitude towards Society.

The Socialist Party announces itself as the party of Society and proposes to defend its interests even before those of the working class. Karl Kautsky, the well-known German Socialist writer, expresses the Socialist position when he says: "Social development stands higher than the interests of the proletariat,

and the Socialist Party cannot protect proletariat interests which stand in the way of social development."²⁰

The chief result of this theory and the reason for its invention is that in great strikes, where the welfare of Society is alleged to be in danger, the Socialists have a good excuse for breaking these strikes. This was the excuse of the Socialists for keeping the railroaders at work during the recent great Swedish strike. Recently Emile Vandervelde, the leader of the Belgian Socialists, questioned as to his attitude to strikers in the public service, in case he became elected Minister, replied: "What would I do? Exactly what we do when there is a strike in the personnel of one of our cooperatives. I would exhaust all the means of conciliation; I would do everything to avoid the struggle. But, if in spite of my efforts, the strike broke out I would say to the personnel: 'I have exhausted all means of conciliation; I have satisfied your demands as far as possible, but I can concede nothing more without compromising the general welfare. And now, since you force me to defend this general welfare against the tyranny of your trade interest, I oppose to your incontestable right to strike, the right, not less incontestable, to replace you by workers more devoted to the interests of the community.'" ²¹ Thus the government employes are warned that if they strike they will be replaced by Socialist scabs.

The Syndicalist takes no cognizance of Society. He is interested only in the welfare of the working class and consistently defends it. He leaves the rag-tag mass of parasites that make up the nonworking class part of Society to look after their own interests. It is immaterial to him what becomes of them so long as the working class advances. He is not afraid of "turning the wheels of progress backwards," in thus constantly confining himself to the interests of the working class, as he knows that by freeing the working class entirely he will give social development the greatest stimulus it has ever known.

The State.—The Socialist is a statist. He considers the State as the logical directing force of Society and proposes to perpetuate it in the future society by confiding to its care the ownership and management of all the industries. He is a vigorous advocate of "law and order" and preaches implicit obedience to the State's mandates, good, bad and indifferent. He recognizes the legal rights of the capitalists to their property and proposes to change the laws that he says give them this ownership.

The Syndicalist, on the other hand, is strictly an antistatist. He considers the State a meddling capitalist institution. He resists its tyrannical interference in his affairs as much as possible and proposes to exclude it from the future society. He is a radical opponent of "law and order," as he knows that for his unions to be "legal" in their tactics would be for them to become impotent. He recognizes no rights of the capitalists to their property, and is going to strip them of it, law or no law.

Constant quarrels rage between the Syndicalists and the Socialists over this matter of legality; the Socialists trying to make the unions "legal" and the Syndicalists trying to make them effective. There is grave danger that in some great revolutionary crisis—which is bound to be "illegal"—the Socialists, in their zeal for "law and order," and the preservation of the State, will ally themselves with the capitalists and proceed to extremes against the outlaw Syndicalists, and thus lead the workers to a terrible defeat. This tendency is already a marked one, as the cited instance of the old-age pension bill in France proves.

Patriotism and Militarism.—The Socialist is necessarily a patriot and a militarist. According to his theory, for the workers of a given country to emancipate themselves, they must control their government. Naturally, for this government to have any power it is necessary that it enjoy political independence. Hence the Socialist considers each nation justified in warring on other nations to secure or maintain this independence. The international Socialist Party stands committed to this patriotic policy. This, of course, involves militarism, and Socialists the world over are militarists. August Bebel, the German Socialist leader, in his book, "Nicht Stehendes Heer, sondern Volkswehr," urged that, in order to the better defend Germany, every able-bodied male should be a soldier from earliest boyhood to old age. He says school and work boys should be drilled during their spare time, Sundays, evenings, etc. Jaures, the noted French Socialist leader, advocates that the sons of labor union officials be placed in command of the companies of boy soldiers he would organize to defend France. The militarism

²⁰ "Zur Agrar Frage," p. 318.

²¹ "Risveglio," Geneva, May 25, 1912.

of various other Socialist leaders, such as Ramsey McDonald of England, and Pablo Iglesias of Spain, is notorious.

The Syndicalist is a radical antipatriot. He is a true internationalist, knowing no country. He opposes patriotism because it creates feelings of nationalism among the workers of the various countries and prevents cooperation between them, and also, because of the militarism it inevitably breeds. He views all forms of militarism with a deadly hatred, because he knows from bitter experience that the chief function of modern armies is to break strikes, and that wars of any kind are fatal to the labor movement. He depends solely on his labor unions for protection from foreign and domestic foes alike and proposes to put an end to war between the nations by having the workers in the belligerent countries go on a general strike and thus make it impossible to conduct wars.

This Syndicalist method of combating war is looked upon with violent disfavor by the Socialists, who consider war a political question and, therefore, no concern of the labor unions. A few years ago, during a Morocco crisis, the C. G. T. sent a delegate to the Socialist labor unions of Germany to organize an antiwar demonstration to propagate the plan of meeting a declaration of war by an international general strike. He was referred to the Socialist Party as having jurisdiction, and thus action on the matter was avoided. At the international Socialist convention, in Copenhagen, 1910, the German Socialist Party delegates successfully opposed a similar proposition on the grounds that the labor unions alone had authority to declare a general strike. Thus the Socialist politicians, on one occasion, referred the question to the Socialist Party, and on the other to the labor unions, and in both cases avoided taking action on this momentous question. This is a fair example of Socialist perfidy when the interests of the working class conflict with those of the Socialist Party.

The Syndicalist and Socialist movements have a hundred fundamental points of conflict. They are absolutely unharmonizable, either on the orthodox Socialist theory or that of the Industrial Socialists. The Syndicalists, realizing that the two movements cannot co-operate, have chosen the more efficient one, the direct action movement, and are developing it and vigorously fighting its natural enemy, the political movement. This fight is to the finish and the rebel worker must get "on one side of the barricade or the other." He cannot stay on both sides. And if he calmly studies the two movements he will surely arrive at the Syndicalist conclusion that the direct action movement is the sole hope of the working class, and that the parasitic political movement, next to the capitalist class itself, is the most dangerous enemy of the working class.

VI. THE RELATIONS OF SYNDICALISM TO ANARCHISM, SOCIALISM AND INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

In revolutionary circles a great deal of confusion exists as to the relations of Syndicalism to Anarchism, Socialism and Industrial Unionism. A few words on this subject may, therefore, be timely.

The Two Great Revolutionary Movements.—Almost since the conception of the revolutionary idea, revolutionists have divided themselves into two general schools—Anarchist and Socialist—and have organized themselves accordingly. These schools are the antipodes of each other in many respects.

The Anarchist is an individualist. He is an anti-democrat, having a supreme contempt for majority rule. He opposes authoritarianism in all its manifestations. He is an inveterate enemy of the State and its laws, and would establish a society in which they will not exist. In his tactics he is a direct actionist.

The Socialist, on the other hand, is a collectivist. He is a democrat and a firm believer in majority rule. Yet with comical inconsistency he also favors authoritarianism and always institutes strong systems of centralization in his vast organizations. He is a statist and legalitarian par excellence, and would perpetuate the State in the future society. He is a political actionist. The famed collectivist doctrine of the class struggle was formulated and propagated by him—Anarchists generally either ignoring or repudiating it.

From Impossibilism to Possibilism.—Originally both the Anarchist and Socialist movements were impossibilist. Both scorned to strive for petty concessions from capitalism and carried on a vigorous propaganda of their ideas, both believing that when they had created sufficient revolutionary sentiment capitalism would be overthrown by a sudden popular uprising.

The Socialist movement was the first to recede from this impossibilist position. Its parliamentary representatives early began bargaining with those of other

parties. This bargaining and compromise has gone on until the Socialist movement has become strictly possibilist and strives for all kinds of petty reforms. This evolution from impossibilism to possibilism has produced a profound effect on the Socialist movement. It has given up its old vitalizing doctrine of the class struggle and has degenerated into a movement of the poor and discontented of all classes against the common oppressor.

Being less exposed to temptation, the Anarchist movement, as a whole, remained impossibilist much longer than did the Socialist. Its first important step toward possibilism was taken in the famed "raid" (mentioned in following chapter) when large numbers of Anarchists joined and captured the French trade unions. This Anarchist "raid" on the labor unions brought three great movements into direct contact—viz., Anarchist, Socialist, and Trade Union. A general flux of ideals, tactics, organization forms, theories, etc., took place. The outcome of this was that the Anarchists, retaining their individualistic principles but little modified, their hatred for the State, etc., fairly incorporated the Trade Union movement into their own. They adopted the labor union as their fighting organization form, and its peculiar type of direct action as their fighting tactics. They also adopted the ex-Socialist doctrine of the class struggle—which had long been anomalous in the all-class Socialist movement—as their fighting theory. In thus adopting a new fighting organization form, tactics and theories, they gave birth to the possibilist Anarchist or Syndicalist movement which is everywhere rapidly absorbing the impossibilist Anarchist movement. Syndicalism has placed the Anarchist movement upon a practical, effective basis. It has at once given it a clear-cut aim (the emancipation of the working class) and the most powerful organizations in modern society (the labor unions) to achieve this aim. Before the advent of Syndicalism the Anarchist movement confusedly and ineffectively appealed to all society and was destitute of organization. Like the Socialist movement, the Anarchist movement has also become possibilist.

The Antagonism Between Anarchism and Syndicalism.—Syndicalism, besides its continual warfare with Socialism, which has already been sufficiently explained and described, has also an important point of quarrel with Anarchism. Though both movements are at one in the matters of principle, ideals, etc., there is much friction between them. The cause for this is not hard to find.

The Anarchist movement proper is an educational one. It says in effect: "The misery of society is due to its ignorance. Remove this ignorance and you abolish the misery." Consequently it places strong emphasis on its attempt to found the modern school; its educational campaigns against the State, church, marriage, sex slavery, etc. Anarchism is striving for an intellectual revolution.

The Syndicalist movement, on the other hand, is a fighting movement. It ascribes the miseries of the workers to the wages system and expends practically all its efforts to build a strong fighting organization with which to combat and finally destroy capitalism. Syndicalism is striving for an economic revolution.

The Syndicalist accepts on principle the Anarchist positions on the modern school, nea-Malthusianism, marriage, individualism, religion, art, the drama, literature, etc., that go to make up the intellectual revolution; but he expends energy upon their propagation only in so far as they contribute to the success of his bread and butter fighting organization. He opposes capitalist institutions in the measure that they oppose him. He does not combat them from any theoretical standpoint. If the church opposes him, he fights it in return. Otherwise he leaves it alone and devotes his energies to combating more active enemies. Consequently many of the intellectual favorites of the Anarchists receive scant courtesy from him. The Anarchist objects to this, calling the Syndicalist a "pork chop" revolutionist, and tries to make an "intellectual" revolutionist of him. But in vain, as the Syndicalist considers the economic revolution a hundredfold more important than the "intellectual" revolution, and is bending all his efforts to its accomplishment.

Syndicalism and Industrial Unionism.—Unlike Syndicalism, the Industrial Union movement of Anglo-Saxon countries is a product of the Socialist movement. It was officially born at the gathering of Socialist politicians who founded the I. W. W. in Chicago, 1905. Although since then it has progressed far toward Syndicalism by the rejection of political action and the adoption of direct action tactics, many traces still linger of its Socialist origin. In these it naturally differs from Syndicalism. A few of the more important ones will be briefly cited:

The Industrial Union movement is universally engaged in a utopian attempt

to build a new and revolutionary labor movement independent of all other labor organizations. Industrial Unionists are in the impossibilist stage of development. Syndicalists, on the contrary, are strictly possibilists, they having emerged from impossibilism, and wherever their movement normally develops they revolutionize the old unions rather than build new ones. The Industrial Union movement is essentially democratic and statist, while the Syndicalist movement is radically opposed to democracy and the State. The Industrial Unionists propose to operate the industries in the future society by a government composed of representatives of the unions, whereas, the Syndicalists propose to exclude the State entirely from the new society. Industrial Unionists are authoritarians, their national labor unions being highly centralized and their local unions destitute of autonomy, whereas Syndicalists are anti-authoritarians, their national labor unions being decentralized and their local unions possessed of complete autonomy. Another difference between Industrial Unionism and Syndicalism is that the former puts emphasis on the industrial form of organization and the "One Big Union" idea, while the latter emphasizes revolutionary tactics. Industrial Unionists also preach the doctrine that there are no leaders in the revolutionary movement, whereas a fundamental principle of Syndicalists is that of the militant minority (outlined in Chapter IX).

VII. HISTORY OF SYNDICALISM

Syndicalism originated in France. From there it has spread all over the civilized world. That France, though comparatively a backward country economically, should be the birthplace of this ultra-modern movement is not surprising.²² For various reasons, which lack of space forbids enumerating here, France has ever been in the vanguard of social progress—the other nations sluggishly following in its wake, profiting by its social experiences. During the past 125 years it has been the scene of numerous revolutions, often embracing the most fundamental changes in social relations. It has passed through so many of these radical social changes that it has been well termed "the home of revolutions." As a result of these revolutions, the French working class, which played a prominent part in all of them, has had the most varied experience of any working class in the world. It is only natural that its labor movement should have reached the highest stage of development. To briefly cite merely a few of these experiences will show how extensive they have been and how naturally it is that Syndicalism has resulted from them.

THE GAMUT OF SOCIAL EXPERIENCE

The Great Revolution.—The French working class, 120 years ago, saw the infamous tyrannies and class distinctions of the ancient regime overthrown, and "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" established by the great revolution. Later it saw these tyrannies and class distinctions reappear in new forms. It earned that through the revolution it had merely changed masters and that the high-sounding equalitarian phrases of the revolution were but mockeries.

Utopian Socialism.—After this great disappointment its militants conceived the idea of Socialism as the solution of their problem. At first they drew up beautiful utopias of co-operative societies, believing that the capitalists and the workers had but to learn of their advantages to accept them. They even went so far as to establish offices* to which the capitalists could throng to give up their property to the new society. These utopians naturally failed.

State Socialism From Above.—In 1848, after a long propaganda of socialistic ideas, the first serious attempt was made to establish Socialism. As a result of a sudden eruption, Louis Philippe was driven from the throne, principally through the efforts of the workers, who found themselves practically in control of the situation. The workers demanded the establishment of Socialism and agreed to starve three months while the government was inaugurating it. They finally forced the reluctant and weak government to appoint a committee "to bring about the revolution." Among other "rights" eventually granted them, the workers were given the "right" to work, and great national workshops were established in Paris at which thousands were given employment. The capitalists, daily growing stronger, decided to put an end to this state Socialism. They abolished the workshops, giving the unemployed the option of starving or joining the army. The workers revolted and for three days held a large portion of Paris. They

²² The economic backwardness of France is often used as an argument against Syndicalism.

finally listened to the appeal of a politician and surrendered, only to see thousands of their best slaughtered in the terrible June massacres.

Co-Operatives.—Doubly disillusioned by this disastrous experience with state Socialism "from above" and political treachery, the militant minority of the French working class turned for emancipation to the co-operative plan. They built up a great co-operative movement, but after years of experiment with it they very generally gave it up as unsuccessful.

The Commune.—Then came the great spontaneous working-class revolt of 1871; the establishment of the Commune; the vain attempts of the workers' government to serve as the directing force in the new Socialist society; the quarrels between the various political factions; the fall of the Commune and the horrible massacres, imprisonings, exilings, etc., that "decapitated the French working class."²³

Working Class Political Action.—After this lesson of the futility of trying to establish Socialism by a violent seizure of the State, a return was made for a few years to the co-operative plan and the political policy of "reward your friends and punish your enemies." These makeshift programs were soon succeeded by the idea of gradually and "legally" gaining control of the State by working-class political action. The organization of the Socialist Party in 1879 followed as a matter of course.

Syndicalism.—After a long, varied and bitter experience with working-class political action, the progressive French militants cast this much-heralded program aside—even as they had the other tried and found wanting plans of "Brotherhood of Man," state Socialism "from above," co-operation, violent seizure of the State, "reward your friends and punish your enemies" political action, etc. And, finally, after veritably running the gamut of social experience; after trying out practically every social panacea ever proposed, and after finding them one and all failures, they at last turned to the labor union as the hope of the working class. Labor unions had existed and been the mainstay of the working class ever since the great revolution, but their worth was long unrecognized by the militant workers who spent their time experimenting with more promising organizations. But as these glittering competitors of the labor unions all demonstrated their worthlessness, the value of the latter finally came to be recognized. The Syndicalist movement resulted. Syndicalism is thus a product of natural selection.

REPUDIATION OF POLITICAL ACTION

The last and perhaps most interesting phase in the evolution of French working-class fighting tactics to Syndicalism was the repudiation of political action. Many causes contributed to it. One of the first—in addition to the growing knowledge of the ineffectiveness of political action—was the splitting of the Socialist Party, shortly after its foundation, into several warring factions. These factions carried their feuds into the labor unions, to their decided detriment. Many unions were either destroyed outright or degenerated into political study clubs.

A reaction soon took place against this devitalization of the unions, and to the cry of "No politics in the unions" they were placed on a basis of neutrality toward political action. This neutrality soon developed into open hostility, when the designs of the politicians to subjugate the unions became unmistakably evident. The Anarchists—whose movement was stronger in France than in any other country in the world—perceived this anti-political tendency in the unions, and, considering them a fertile field for their propaganda, during the '90s made their celebrated "raid" upon them. This event—which Sorel says is one of the most important in modern history—may be said to mark the birth of Syndicalist movement proper.²⁴

The revolt against political action and the development of Syndicalism were given a great stimulus when the Socialists gained a considerable degree of political power in 1900 as a result of the Dreyfus affair. Then the fundamental antagonisms between the Syndicalist and Socialist movements became clear.

²³ Marx and Engels in a late preface to the Manifesto of the Communist Party remark of the Commune: "One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz., 'the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.'"

²⁴ Syndicalism was not recognized as a distinct movement until the C. G. T. convention at Amiens, in 1906. One delegate thus announced it: "There has been too much said here as though there were only Socialists and Anarchists present. It has been overlooked that there are, above all, Syndicalists here. Syndicalism is a new social theory."

The Socialist representatives, either in their own interests or that of their party, deliberately betrayed the interests of the working class. The three Socialist ministers—Millerand, with his "social peace" schemes; Viviani, with his "old age pensions for the dead," and Briand, with his soldier scabs—drove thousands of workers out of the Socialist and into the Syndicalist movement and made the rupture between the two movements complete.

LATER HISTORY

Since the advent of the Socialist to political power the course of the Syndicalist movement has been phenomenal. Getting control of the C. G. T. and most of its constituent organizations, the Syndicalists have made modern French labor history a long series of spectacular strikes, etc., such as the eight-hour-day movement of 1904-6, the postal strike of 1909, the railroad strike of 1910, etc., which have shaken French capitalism to its foundations. And the successes of the Syndicalist movement have not been confined to France. The movement has been transplanted into practically every capitalist country and is everywhere making great headway. This is especially true of England, where the recent series of great strikes, instigated by the Syndicalists, has startled the world.

The working classes in these countries that have imported Syndicalism have not had the extensive experience of the French working class, so they did not spontaneously generate Syndicalism as the latter did. By importing, ready made, the Syndicalist philosophy, tactics, ethics, etc., so laboriously developed in France, they are skipping several rungs in the evolutionary ladder and profiting by the century and a quarter of costly experiences of the French working class.

VIII. SYNDICALISM AND THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

For various reasons—but principally because of the great opportunities that have existed until recent years for individual workers to better their conditions—American workers as a class are more backward in the defense of their interests than are the workers of any other country. Their labor unions, with their antique fighting tactics and obsolete philosophy, are the laughing stock of revolutionists the world over. They are utterly unfit to combat the modern aggregations of capital. The working class, whose sole defense they are against the capitalist class, is in retreat before the latter's attacks. If this course is to be arrested and the workers started upon the road to emancipation, the American labor movement must be revolutionized. It must be placed upon a Syndicalist basis.

This revolution must be profound, as American labor unions—save that they are aggregations of workers organized to fight their employers—have but little in common with Syndicalist unions. Some of the principal changes necessary in ideals, forms, tactics, etc., will be indicated in the following pages.

"*A Fair Day's Pay for a Fair Day's Work.*"—This formula expresses the vague ideal for which the majority of American labor unions are striving. Such unions grant the right to their masters to exploit them, only asking in return that they be given a "fair" standard of living. It is a slave ideal.

The eradication, through education, of the ignorant conservatism from whence this slave ideal springs, is the most important steps to be taken in the placing of the American labor movement upon an effective basis. The workers must learn that they are the producers of all wealth, and that they alone are entitled to enjoy it. Inspired by this knowledge, they will refuse to recognize the claim of their masters to even the smallest fraction of this wealth. They will then have a keen sense of their wrongs and a bitter hatred for capitalism, instead of their present indifference. They will then war in earnest upon their masters and will never rest content until, by the abolition of the wage system, they will have forced them to disgorge their ill-gotten booty.

Harmony of Interests of Capital and Labor.—Along with the slave ideal of "a fair day's pay for a fair day's work" must go the idiotic doctrine of the harmony of interests of capital and labor, which many labor leaders are so fond of enunciating.

This doctrine is a veritable monument to the ignorance of American workers, and the participation of their union officials in the notorious Civic Federation—which is founded on this doctrine—is a crime and a disgrace to their movement. The workers will have to learn the self-evident fact that in almost every respect the interests of the workers and their employers are diametrically opposite and unharmonizable; that the workers produce just so much, and that it is to their

interest to retain as much of this product as they can, through higher wages, shorter hours, better working conditions, etc., whereas it is to the interest of their employers to rob them of as much of this product as possible, through low wages, long hours, wretched working conditions, etc. They must learn that the great strikes now convulsing the world are battles in the inevitable worldwide warfare between the capitalists and working classes over the division of the product of labor, and that his warfare must go on until the working class has vanquished the capitalist class and abolished the wage system. And, finally, they must learn that any labor leader who preaches the harmony of interest doctrine is either an incompetent ignoramus or a traitor to the working class, and should be treated as such.

Craft Unionism and the Contract.—Craft Unionism—or, more properly, Sectional Unionism, as all nonrevolutionary labor unions, whether organized on craft or industrial lines, are alike commonly designated “craft” unions—is a prolific source of weakness to the labor movement. By its division of the working class into various sections, each of which, knowing and caring little about the interests of the others, shortsightedly tries to defend the narrow, immediate interests of its own members, Craft Unionism cripples the fighting power of the workers. It sends the working class piecemeal to fight the united capitalists, who, in addition to their own power, artfully use that of the great mass of workers at peace with them to crush the few in revolt.

Their usual method of pitting one section of the working class against another is by the contract. An employer will make contracts, each of which expires at a different date, with the various “craft” unions of his workers. When the first contract expires and the “craft” union directly concerned goes on strike, the balance remain at work and thus help to defeat it. These unwise unions are similarly trounced, one at a time, at the expiration of their contracts. So common has this custom become that Craft Unionism has come to signify but little better than union scabbery. As it robs the workers of their fighting force, Craft Unionism is rightfully looked upon as one of the strongest supports of the capitalist system.

The fundamental error of Craft Unionism is that it takes no cognizance of the class struggle. It attempts to successfully pit small fractions of the working class against not only the great power of the capitalist class, but also against that of the balance of the working class. The remedy for it and the contract evil, which is its inseparable companion, is for the workers to learn that they all have interests in common and that if they will develop their tremendous power and make their interests prevail, they must act together as a unit. Having learned this, they will discard the suicidal “craft” union motto of “Each for himself and the devil take the hindmost,” and adopt the revolutionary slogan of “An injury to one is the concern of all.” They will replace the inefficient partial strike of Craft Unionism with the potent general strike of Syndicalism and forge forward on the road to economic liberty.

Autonomy.—The scabbery of the “craft” unions upon each other is chiefly ascribed by Industrial Unionists to the fact that these unions—both A. F. of L. and independent—are autonomous; that is, each reserves to itself the right to work or strike as it sees fit, and to otherwise generally transact its own affairs regardless of the others. They claim that if the workers were organized into strongly centralized unions and under the direct control of an all-powerful executive board, this union scabbery would cease. Their theory is that this beneficent executive board—which in some miraculous way is going to be revolutionary, no matter what the condition of the rank and file—would always force all the unions out in support of all strikers, however few they might be.

This absurd remedy flows naturally from the Industrial Unionists’ shallow diagnosis of the cause of union scabbery. Even the most cursory examination of labor history will show that while occasionally organized workers, through pure ignorance, will scab on each other, by far the greater part of union scabbery is due not to the autonomy of the unions, but to the lack of it; to the dictatorial powers of the officials of the various national unions. These officials, either through the innate conservatism of officialdom, fear of jeopardizing the rich funds in their care, or downright treachery, ordinarily use their great powers to prevent strikes or to drive their unions’ members back to work after they have struck in concert with other workers.

Indeed, it is almost the regular order of procedure for the rank and file of “craft” unions, during the big strikes, to surge in revolt in support of the striking workers, and for the union officials to crush this revolt—often with the most unscrupulous means. Every big American strike produces instances of this

repression of the rank and file. The present newspaper strike in Chicago furnishes a couple of typical ones. The stereotypers pooled their grievances with the pressmen and struck. For this their local union was immediately expelled from the national union by the general officers on the pretense that it had violated its contract. As a companion feat to this, Jim Lynch, the notorious head of the International Typographical Union, personally prevented the printers from also joining the strike.

The evil of centralized power in labor unions is by no means confined to the American labor movement. It is a world-wide phenomenon. For instance, the great English working-class revolt of the past couple of years has occurred in the face of the most determined opposition of the union leaders, who, instead of being in the van of the movement, as they should be according to the Industrial Unionist theory, are being dragged along, willy nilly, in its wake. The immense German labor unions also give abundant proofs of the evils of centralization. These unions are the nearest approach in form to the Industrial Unionist ideal of any unions in the world. They are all ruled by powerful executive boards—the local unions being destitute of the right to strike at will, raise strike funds, or even to elect their own local officers. The result is that they rarely go on strike, their union dictators simply refusing to allow them to do so. The type of ultra revolutionary executive board, dreamed of by the I. W. W., which will force the workers to strike together, has not developed in practice.

Syndicalists have noted this universal baneful influence of centralized power in labor unions and have learned that if the workers are ever to strike together they must first conquer the right to strike from their labor union officials. Therefore, it is a fundamental principle with them the world over that their unions be decentralized and that the workers alone have the power to decide on the strike.

The C. G. T. of France, which is, for its size, by far the most powerful labor organization in the world, is a typical decentralized Syndicalist union. In it the various national craft and industrial unions²⁵ are strictly independent of each other; they being bound together by only the most general regulations regarding per capita tax, etc. The federated unions in the various localities (*bourses du travail*) are also autonomous, each deciding for itself all important matters, such as the strike, etc. For instance, the National Federation of Building Trades Workers is divided locally in Paris into thirty-four local craft unions. Each of these local unions individually retains the right to work or strike at will, regardless of the decision of the other thirty-three local unions in the same national union, or of the decision of the national union itself. And yet these thirty-four autonomous local unions can show a better record of solidarity and general strikes than any other building trades organization in the world. The matchless solidarity that characterizes them is due to the understanding of their members that they have interests in common, and not to the compulsion of some beneficent, omnipotent executive board à la I. W. W. Indeed, long experience has taught the French unions that the first consideration for solidarity is the abolition of meddling executive boards.

What is needed in the American labor movement is not less autonomy, but more of it. The executive boards of the various national unions will have to be stripped of their legislative powers and these powers vested in the local unions where they belong. Even though these local unions at present may be hampered by ignorance of their true interests, they are a hundred times rather to be trusted with power than a few national officials who are exposed to all kinds of corrupt and conservative influences. The working class can never emancipate itself by proxy even though its proxies be labor union officials.

Labor Fakery.—The American labor movement is infested with hordes of dishonest officials who misuse the power conferred upon them to exploit the labor

²⁵ There are both craft and industrial unions in the C. G. T. Syndicalists by no means put as strong emphasis upon the industrial form of labor union as the Industrial Unionists do. They know that industrial unions, when properly organized, viz., in a decentralized form, by bringing the workers into closer touch with each other, eliminating many useless officers, headquarters, etc., are undoubtedly superior to a number of craft unions covering the same categories of workers, and they appreciate them accordingly. But they also know that when industrial unions are improperly organized, viz., in a centralized form, by throwing vast masses of workers under a small dictatorial executive board, they are inferior to a number of craft unions covering the same categories of workers. This is obvious, as the workers in the various craft unions—even though these be centralized—are able to exert a certain amount of influence upon their executive boards; whereas, where each category of workers is but a small unit in a big centralized industrial union their demands for strike, etc., are ignored by the conglomerate executive board. This is well illustrated in Germany, where the unions have decidedly lost in vigor by massing their lives into centralized industrial unions.

movement to their own advantage, even though this involves the betrayal of the interests of the workers. The exploits of these labor fakers are too well known to need recapitulations here. Suffice to say the labor faker must go.

The French labor movement presents several excellent methods of exterminating and preventing the labor faker. The chief of these is the decentralized form of the unions. This form, by taking the power out of the hands of executive committees, takes away the very foundation of labor fakerism, viz., delegated power. Another method is to make official positions financially unattractive to fakers by attaching but small salaries to them (the two secretaries of the C. G. T. receive only \$50.00 per month.) This custom of paying small salaries has also the wholesome effect of making labor union officials feel like working men, instead of like capitalists, as many American labor leaders do. Another faker deterrent is to make official positions so dangerous—owing to the "illegal" tactics of the unions their officials are in constant danger of imprisonment—that fakers have small taste for them. French Syndicalists also object strenuously to individuals making a profession of labor leading, and it is a common occurrence for high union officials to go back to the ranks on the expiration of their terms of office.

The result of these methods is that the French labor movement is remarkably free from labor fakers. As a rule, only the best and most courageous of the workers accept the dangerous and poorly paid official positions. These workers vie with each other in venturesomeness and keep the prisons full. If, however, in spite of these checks, a faker does develop, he is given short shift. He is disposed of with the most convenient expedient, "legal" or "illegal." American workers couldn't do better than to apply French methods to their faker pest.

The Unskilled.—The pernicious and widely prevalent policy of excluding unskilled workers from the labor unions must cease. For their own immediate interests—not to mention class interests—the skilled workers, for two leading reasons, must have the co-operation of the unskilled workers in their industries. In the first place, labor is so specialized and simplified in modern industry that when the ordinary so-called skilled worker goes on strike his place can readily be filled by an unskilled worker who has even the most rudimentary knowledge of the trade. Skilled workers have lost innumerable strikes from this cause. The only way to prevent this scabbery is to take into the union all skilled and unskilled workers directly connected with a given craft or industry. This will make them all realize their common interests and prevent their scabbing upon each other.

And in the second place, the skilled workers in the larger industries are in such a minority that they cannot seriously disorganize these industries—and without this disorganization of industry they cannot win concessions from their employers. To be able to win they must pool their demands with those of the unskilled workers, and, by striking with them, bring whole industries to a standstill. This involves letting the unskilled workers into their unions.

Job Trusts.—The job trust unions are a curse to the American labor movement. With their high initiation fees, closed books, apprenticeship restrictions, etc., they are prolific producers of the scab. Like the strictly skilled workers' unions, and for the same reasons, they must go. They must be succeeded by broad unions with low initiation fees and a universal free transfer system. These unions must be inspired by class ideals and organized on the principle of "Once a union man, always a union man."

Legality.—The campaign for "law and order" tactics that is continually carried on in the unions by various kinds of legalitarians and weaklings exerts a bad influence upon them. It must cease. The workers must be taught to use all kinds of successful tactics—whether these have been sanctioned by the ruling class or not. Had the workers awaited legal permission they never would have built up their labor unions, as these organizations and their fighting tactics have always been illegal, and have been developed in the face of most drastic governmental persecution. For the labor unions to become legal would be for them to commit suicide. All laws calculated to hinder their growth and activities have been made only to be broken. A vigorous campaign must be waged in the unions to apprise the workers of this fact.

Overtime, Fast Working, and Piece Work.—These three factors, by increasing the army of the unemployed, are very detrimental to the labor movement. They must all three be abolished. The workers must refuse to work overtime and by the piece. They must also give up their present rapid rate of work, and, by systematically sabotaging their work, turn out as little as possible of it. This slowing down of production will have the same effect as a shortening of the

working day. It will provide employment for thousands of workers now unemployed, and will place the whole working class in a much better position to enforce their demands upon their employers.

Sick and Death Benefits.—The beneficial institutions with which American labor unions are loaded unquestionably very seriously lessen the fighting abilities of these unions. They prostitute the unions from their true functions as aggressive organizations to the false ones of defensive organizations. They do this by causing great sums of money to be piled up in the hands of national committees, who, of course, have full power to protect these funds. These committees, wishing to prevent their funds from being jeopardized by strikes, ordinarily use this power to prevent strikes and to direct the minds of the workers into insurance channels. Such funds are fruitful sources of harmful centralization. Rebels all over the world are unanimous in their condemnation.

Strike Benefits.—Large strike benefits are doubly detrimental to the labor movement. On the one hand, like sick and death benefits, they cause centralization and weaken the action of the unions by placing large funds in the hands of powerful national committees, who keep these funds intact by preventing strikes. And, on the other hand, they cause the workers to depend for success upon their niggardly savings—which are utterly eclipsed by the immense funds of the capitalists—instead of upon their economic power, which is invincible.

The modern strike, dependent upon funds for success, is ordinarily long, legal and a failure. Such strikes are obsolete. The successful type of modern strike is short and depends for its success upon the disorganization of industry it causes. The funds, if any are needed to finance it, are usually raised in the heat of the battle from non-striking workers, who at such times are ready givers.

Small strike funds held by local unions, may be permissible, but large strike funds held by national committees are strictly to be condemned.

The Unions and Politics.—A word of caution on this point: The Syndicalists in the United States have ahead of them a long and hard fight with the politicians for the control of the labor movement. They run but one serious danger in this fight, and that is that their hatred for the politicians may lead them to write antipolitical clauses into the preambles and constitutions of the unions under their control.

Labor unions are organizations of workers organized on the basis of their common economic interests. To be successful they require the cooperation of workers of all kinds, regardless of their personal opinions. Consequently they cannot, without disastrous consequences to themselves, make personal convictions—whether in regard to politics, religion or any other matter foreign to the labor unions—a qualification for membership in them. Therefore, Syndicalists must keep the unions under their control officially neutral toward politics. Let their policy be "No politics in the union." As individuals they can safely fight the politicians to their hearts' content.

This is the policy of the French Syndicalists and has proven very successful in the C. G. T. This organization, though controlled by the Syndicalists, is officially neutral toward politics. As a consequence it has in its ranks several unions controlled by Socialists, not to mention the thousands of Socialists in the other unions under the control of Syndicalists. If the C. G. T. took an antipolitical stand it would undoubtedly lose this large Socialist element and the French labor movement would suffer the calamity of being split into two warring factions.

In the foregoing pages only the more important evils afflicting American labor unionism have been gone into, and their remedies indicated. Lack of space forbids the discussion of the many minor ones with which it bristles. But the rebel worker, in his task of putting the American labor movement upon a Syndicalist basis, will have no difficulty in recognizing them and their antidotes when he encounters them.

To revolutionize the American labor movement, Syndicalists must follow the course taken by successful Syndicalists the world over, viz., develop the existing unions and organize unions for those workers for whom at present none exist.²⁶ The natural course of evolution for a labor movement—even as

²⁶The I. W. W. plan of building an entirely new and revolutionary labor movement, on the theory that the old conservative unions are incapable of evolution and must go out of existence, is a freak. It was arbitrarily invented by the Socialist politicians who founded the I. W. W. A few years previous, these politicians, in launching their political movement, had condemned all existing political parties as nonworking class by nature and founded the Socialist Party, to which they gave a monopoly of representing the political interests of the working class. When they felt the need for an economic "wing" to their movement, as the Socialist Party was progressing favorably, they followed exactly the same

for individual workers—is gradually from the conservative to the revolutionary. Syndicalists are natural educators and leaders of the working class and by actively participating in the labor movement they can greatly hasten this evolution. They can best make their influence felt upon the labor movement through the medium of the organized militant minority.

THE MILITANT MINORITY

In every group of human beings, be it Y. W. C. A., A. F. of L., M. & M., Salvation Army or what not, there are to be found a certain few individuals who exercise a great influence over the thoughts and actions of the rest of the mass of individuals composing the group. They are the directing forces of these groups—the sluggish mass simply following their lead. They are natural leaders and maintain their leadership through their superior intellect, energy, courage, cunning, organizing ability, oratorical power, etc., as the case may be. They are militant minorities.

The labor movement, owing to its peculiar nature, is especially fertile in and responsive to the efforts of militant minorities of various sorts, such as Syndicalists, Anarchists, Socialists, Craft Unionists, Clericals, etc., who are each striving to control it for their own ends. All over the world it will be found following the lead of one or more of these militant minorities. The most potent of all the militant minorities in the labor movement are the Syndicalists, whose vigorous philosophy, ethics, and tactics—which are those par excellence of the labor movement—coupled with their unflagging energy and courage, born of the revolution, make them invincible in the struggle between the various militant minorities for the control of the labor movement. Scattered through conservative unions, they simply compel the great mass of workers into action and to become revolutionary, in spite of the contrary efforts of other militant minorities. It was for the Syndicalist militants that the term “militant minority” was coined, and it is ordinarily applied solely to them—a somewhat incorrect usage, which, however, will henceforth be complied with in this pamphlet.

Organization and Power of the Militant Minority.—French Syndicalists have noted the great power of the militant minority, and by thoroughly organizing and exploiting it have made their labor movement the most revolutionary and powerful in the world. The Syndicalists in England, Spain, Italy, etc., patterning after the French, have achieved their success by using similar tactics.

The usual French method of organizing the militant minority in a given union is for the Syndicalists in this union to establish a paper devoted to their interests. Through the columns of this paper, which is the nucleus of their organization, they at once propagate revolutionary ideas, standardize their policies, instigate strike movements, and organize their attacks on the conservative forces in the unions. A fighting machine is thus built up which enables the Syndicalists to act as a unit at all times and to thoroughly exploit their combined power.

The power of the militant minority, when so organized is immense. Let us cite the recent French railroad strike as an illustration of it. Until a couple of years ago the French railroad unions, dominated by Socialists, were so conservative that it was a common saying that they would never strike again. But a few months after the militant minority deposed the Socialist railroad union dictator,

course as they had pursued at the latter's founding; they condemned all existing unions and founded the I. W. W., to which they generously gave a monopoly on representing the economic interests of the working class. They made absolutely no investigation of the problems presented by a universal dual labor organization—as the minutes of the first I. W. W. convention show. They jumped at the conclusion that if a new political party could succeed, so could a new universal labor organization.

The dual organization theory of the I. W. W. has no justification in this country—where the I. W. W. is a distinct failure and the old unions are showing marked capacities for evolution—nor in any other country in the world. In every European country, where similar attempts have been made to ignore the old conservative unions and build new revolutionary movements—as in Germany, England (I. W. W.), and Sweden—these attempts have been failures and the Syndicalist movements are weak, while in every European country where efforts have been made to revolutionize the old unions—as in France, England (Syndicalist leagues), Spain, Italy, Portugal—they have been successful, and the Syndicalist movements are strong.

The comparative effectiveness of the two methods has been recently strikingly illustrated in the English labor movement. For several years the I. W. W. had unsuccessfully tried to found a new revolutionary movement independent of the old trade union movement, when, a couple of years ago, a few Syndicalists, headed by Tom Mann, began propagating revolutionary ideas in the old unions. The recent series of great strikes and the rapid growth of Syndicalism in England are eloquent testimonials to the effectiveness of their tactics.

Guerard, France was shaken by the recent great strike of 50,000 railroad workers. This strike, which, though broken by the Socialists (as related in an earlier chapter), was one of the most remarkable demonstrations of working-class power and solidarity that have ever occurred, was directly due to the activities of the militant minority. The persecution which followed the strike enables us to estimate approximately the numerical strength of this minority. In all, 3,300 workers were discharged from throughout the railroad service—nonstriking roads included—on the pretense that they were responsible for the strike. But of this number it is doubtful if more than 1,000 were militant Syndicalists, as the persecution was so rigorous that hundreds of men were discharged for simply saying the strike was justified or something similar, and other hundreds were discharged as agitators by bosses who had stored up petty grievances against them and seized this favorable opportunity to get rid of them.

And it is to the activities of these approximately 1,000 militants that this epoch-making strike must be credited. They were the real moving force behind the strike. By their vigor, courage, arguments, etc., they drew the mass of workers after them in spite of their own indifference, governmental opposition, Socialist hostility, etc. They were the life of the strike—the leaven that leaveneth the whole. The rest of the workers were but little better than pawns or putty—to be manipulated as the militants chose.

Similar instances of the power of the militant minority might be cited from the history of almost every union in France, in all of which the militant minority is more or less organized. The handfuls of organized rebels in these unions, with the cooperation of their national organization, which, like that in the individual unions, is formed through rebel papers, are rapidly winning the labor movement from Socialist control, and are infusing it with revolutionary spirit and making a vigorous fighting machine of it.

The Militant Minority in the United States.—The militant minority, which is such a potent factor in the French labor movement, is utterly disorganized in the American labor movement. Even its existence as a factor in the labor movement—to say nothing of its potentialities—is unsuspected by all save a comparatively few observers. This state of affairs is directly due to the I. W. W.

Ever since its foundation, seven years ago, the I. W. W. has carried on a vigorous propaganda of the doctrine that the old conservative unions are incapable of evolution and must be supplanted by a "ready-made" revolutionary movement. Beginning as it did, at a time when American revolutionists were almost entirely unacquainted with the principles and powers of the militant minority, this doctrine has produced a profound effect upon them. In fact, practically all of them—Anarchists, Socialists and Industrial Unionists alike—have accepted it unquestioningly as true. They have become obsessed with the notion that nothing can be accomplished in the old unions, and that the sooner they go out of existence the better it will be for the labor movement. As a natural consequence they, with rare exceptions, have either quit the old unions and become directly hostile to them, or they have become so much dead material in them, making no efforts to improve them. The result is a calamity to the labor movement. It has been literally stripped of its soul. The militants who could inspire it with revolutionary vigor have been taken from it by this ridiculous theory. They have left the old unions, where they could have wielded a tremendous influence, and gone into sterile isolation. They have left the labor movement in the undisputed control of conservatives and fakers of all kinds to exploit as they see fit.²⁷

Practically all the unions showed marked evil effects of the desertion and disarming of their militants. Of the innumerable instances of such that might be cited let us mention only the typical case of the Western Federation of Miners.

According to a statement made recently by Vincent St. John—at present secretary-treasurer of the I. W. W.—the W. F. of M., when it was in its best fighting days, several years ago, was dominated and controlled by a fighting minority of about ten percent of its membership. This militant minority was so well organized and effective, however, that it compelled the whole W. F. of M. to be a fighting organization. It was a living proof of the power of the militant minority.

But today the W. F. of M. is a conservative organization. It has lost its former vigor and is rapidly developing into a typical Socialist labor union-voting machine. This decline is due to the disorganization of the W. F. of M.'s once power-

²⁷ Had the militant majority of French railroads adopted this course of tactics, there is little doubt but that their great strike would never have occurred.

ful militant minority, which occurred when the W. F. of M., because of a factional quarrel, withdrew from the I. W. W. On this event the bulk of the W. F. of M. militants, being obsessed with the patriotic I. W. W. doctrine that none other than an I. W. W. union can be revolutionary, either quit the W. F. of M. or became inactive in it. The Haywoods, St. Johns, Heslewoods, and the other strong militants, who had made the W. F. and M. the fighting organization that it once was, quit fighting to control their union. They became merely onlookers so far as it was concerned. The result is that the Socialists are left in almost undisputed control of it, to the sad detriment of its fighting spirit.

Many similar instances of the disorganization of the militant minority in the various unions might be cited did space permit. But American direct-actionists are finally arousing themselves from the inaction that has crippled them so long. They are beginning to realize that the dream of the I. W. W. is impossible and that the American labor movement, in becoming revolutionary, will follow the natural evolutionary course taken by the labor movements of all countries. They are beginning to realize that while they have been separated from the labor movement, mumbling phrases about the impossibility of doing anything in the old unions, the Socialists—who are rapidly freeing themselves from the I. W. W. idea—have been driving the old line craft union fakers before them and taking charge of the labor movement. They are getting an inkling of the powers and possibilities of the militant minority and are proceeding to organize it. This organization is the Syndicalist League of North America.

THE SYNDICALIST LEAGUE OF NORTH AMERICA

The Syndicalist League of North America is an organization of Syndicalists, formed for the purpose of effectively propagating Syndicalist tactics, principles, etc., among all groups of organized and unorganized workers. **IT IS NOT A LABOR UNION, AND IT DOES NOT ALLOW ITS BRANCHES TO AFFILIATE WITH LABOR UNIONS.** It is simply an educational league with the task of educating the labor movement to Syndicalism.

The S. L. of N. A. plan of organization, somewhat similar to that of the Industrial Syndicalist League, which is playing such a prominent part in the present revolution in the English labor movement, is a variation from the French plan. In addition to founding Syndicalist papers in the various industries, it organizes the rebels into dues-paying leagues. These Syndicalist leagues, which enable the militants in many ways to better exploit their power, are of two kinds, viz., local and national. A local Syndicalist league consists of all the Syndicalists in a given locality, and a national Syndicalist league consists of all the Syndicalists in a given craft or industry.

The S. L. of N. A. is a possibilist organization with a practical program. It considers the utopian policy of a universal dual organization a most pernicious one because it at once introduces disastrous jurisdictional wars in the labor movement and destroys the efficiency of the militant minority. Its first principle is unity in the labor movement. It is based on the demonstrated fact that the labor movement will become revolutionary in the measure that the individuals composing it become educated. It is, therefore, seeking to bring about this education by the exploitation of the militant minority. Consequently, it seizes every opportunity to introduce betterments, great or small, into the labor movement. Though in existence but a few months, it has already achieved remarkable success. It is responsible for the removal of a number of abuses from, and the introduction of a number of improvements into several international unions. It is also a potent factor in the various localities where it has branch leagues established.

The S. L. of N. A. is demonstrating that the American labor movement is ripe for a revolution and that the conservative forces opposed to this revolution are seemingly strong only because they have had no opposition. It is making them crumble before the attacks of the militant minority, organized and conscious of its strength.

All workmen interested in this movement to place the American labor movement upon a Syndicalist basis can secure full information regarding the S. L. of N. A. by communicating with

(Wherenpon, at 4:30 p. m., the committee adjourned until 10 a. m., Thursday, November 8, 1945.)

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *Thursday, November 8, 1945.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding. The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please be in order. Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Adamson?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, sir. Will you take the stand, please, Mr. Foster?

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, NEW YORK, N. Y.—RESUMED

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, how many books and pamphlets would you say you have written since the one on syndicalism, which you say you have repudiated?

Mr. FOSTER. Half a dozen books and 30 or 40 pamphlets.

Mr. ADAMSON. And do you also contribute articles to magazines and newspapers?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you also speak and lecture around from time to time? Is that true?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. Are your literary and speaking activities conducted by you exclusively for and on account of the Communist Party, or do you receive compensation personally for them?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I work for the Communist Party.

Mr. ADAMSON. And all the revenues from your activities go into the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right, all of them.

Mr. ADAMSON. And how do you obtain your compensation from your literary work? Do you copyright your books?

Mr. FOSTER. The books are copyrighted, I understand, and during the course of the year, I think I have received all told two or three hundred dollars in royalties. That is all.

Mr. ADAMSON. But all of your compensation and your expenses then come from the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. ADAMSON. And during the life of the Communist Association, you continued your activities with them just as with the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. Just the same thing, the same relationship.

Mr. ADAMSON. You have a "Z" in your name, Mr. Foster. What does that stand for?

Mr. FOSTER. It is just a pen name.

Mr. ADAMSON. It doesn't stand for any particular name?

Mr. FOSTER. No significance beyond that.

Mr. ADAMSON. There was at one time a William Zachariah or Zacharias Foster active in strikes in St. Louis. Are you the same man, or is that a different man?

Mr. FOSTER. I couldn't say. I have participated in strikes in St. Louis. I don't know whether it refers to me or not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, I understand this Foster said that the employers in St. Louis had agreed to pay him \$15,000 for stopping the strikes out there. Are you the same man?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I am sure it wasn't me now.

Mr. ADAMSON. But you are the Foster who was active in strikes and the incident at Herrin, Ill., some years ago?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I am not.

Mr. ADAMSON. You had nothing to do with that?

Mr. FOSTER. No, only insofar as I might have written about it from a distance.

Mr. ADAMSON. Were you ever associated, politically or otherwise, with Emma Goldman?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. Weren't you in Russia with her at one time, or at the same time?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; she was there at the same time I was.

Mr. ADAMSON. And were you both there in connection with business for the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I was not there on business for the Communist Party. I was really there in connection with the Trade Union Educational League. That was before I was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you tell us something about the Trade Union Educational League?

Mr. FOSTER. The Trade Union League has been liquidated some 15 years ago. I would like to know what that has got to do with these hearings?

Mr. ADAMSON. You mentioned it, Mr. Foster. And what, if any, connection did that league have with the Communist movement?

Mr. FOSTER. At that time, none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, what did it have subsequently?

Mr. FOSTER. What has that got to do with un-American activities?

Mr. ADAMSON. I don't know.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't mind coming down here and being persecuted day after day with these nonsensical hearings, but let us at least confine ourselves to real questions. It is getting so I have to serve a sentence before this committee instead of coming here for information. I think it is about time we are done with this ridiculous performance.

Mr. ADAMSON. I don't want to ask you anything that would incriminate you.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not incriminating me.

Mr. ADAMSON. If there is any reason why you are afraid or do not wish to answer the question, if you will so state, I will not press it.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no danger of you incriminating me. You are just annoying me. That is all.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well, suppose you tell us, then, the connection of the Trade Union League with the Communist movement.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I protest against this digging up of ancient history for the purpose of creating a red scare in the country. I should think this committee would learn from your experience in New York City a few days ago that this stuff is a little bit on the stale side, this red baiting.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, do you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not refuse to answer the question, Mr. Chairman, but—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Please answer it, then, and let us get along.

Mr. FOSTER. I am willing to get along. I am willing to dispense with the hearings altogether. So far as getting along is concerned, I think it has been ridiculous so far.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the committee is not concerned with your opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. I was brought here, I believe, to express my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. You are here to answer questions.

Mr. ADAMSON. No one has restrained you from expressing your opinions, Mr. Foster. All through the hearing you have had great liberty of action.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been badgered here like a criminal. That is what has happened to me. I haven't been given an opportunity to half answer many of the questions that have been put to me. You would not dare to treat any other witness like you have treated me, and like you treat other Communists before the committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. Suppose you answer it in your own way now.

Mr. FOSTER. I have answered it that I think it is nonsensical to dig up the history of an organization that was liquidated some 10 or 15 years ago, or more.

Mr. ADAMSON. You have made frequent references to trade unions in your testimony, and you have mentioned this league.

Mr. FOSTER. I mentioned it in answer to a direct question from you.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, will you tell us what connection that organization had with the Communist movement?

Mr. FOSTER. I answered that it had no connection at the period you mention, nor afterwards, for that matter.

Mr. ADAMSON. It is your statement, then, that this league has never had any connection with the Communist movement?

Mr. FOSTER. I repeat my answer, Mr. Chairman, and I request that this ridiculous line of questioning be stopped.

The CHAIRMAN. Your answer originally was that it did not at that time. You have answered now or ever?

Mr. FOSTER. I answer or ever. Communists belonged to it, and that is all.

Mr. ADAMSON. How many times have you been to Russia, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, I have been there a number of times. What has that got to do with un-American activities?

Mr. ADAMSON. Was it your practice to go every year?

Mr. FOSTER. Plenty people go to Russia.

Mr. ADAMSON. And was it your practice to go every year?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the trouble is not enough go to Russia. If more went to Russia we would probably learn something about the country, and maybe would adopt a little more friendly attitude than we are following.

Mr. ADAMSON. I agree with you that a lot more people in this country ought to go to Russia.

Mr. FOSTER. You included. It would be very educational for you, I think.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you speak or read Russian?

Mr. FOSTER. No. I read a little bit, not much.

Mr. ADAMSON. You have never written, then, in Russian?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Mr. ADAMSON. When you go to Russia, Mr. Foster, or when you have been in Russia, all your transactions over there then are carried on through interpreters? Isn't that true?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, obviously, if I don't speak Russian, and I want to communicate with Russians, somebody has to tell me what they are saying. I think that follows logically.

Mr. ADAMSON. So that everything that is told to you over there you get second-hand. Is that true? You are not able to speak or read the Russian language even when you are there?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know what this nonsensical line of questions is leading up to. What is the purpose of such a question?

Mr. ADAMSON. Isn't that true?

Mr. FOSTER. What are you trying to wangle out of me?

The CHAIRMAN. He says Mr. Adamson, he doesn't write it or speak it. It obviously follows that whatever information he gets through the Russian language must come through interpreters.

Mr. FOSTER. Like anybody else in the country where they don't speak the language.

Mr. ADAMSON. By the way, Mr. Foster, did you assist in the management or conduct of the communistic meeting that was held on September 24th at Madison Square Garden in New York? I believe you said you made a speech there?

Mr. FOSTER. I spoke at a meeting on approximately that date.

Mr. ADAMSON. Did you assist in the arrangement for the meeting, or were you just a speaker?

Mr. FOSTER. I was a speaker.

Mr. ADAMSON. You had nothing to do with the meeting, the setting of it?

Mr. FOSTER. Not particularly; no.

Mr. ADAMSON. Weren't those proceedings at that meeting broadcast?

Mr. FOSTER. No; not to my knowledge.

Mr. ADAMSON. They were not on the radio?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then you don't know whether your speech went out over the radio or not?

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure it did not.

Mr. ADAMSON. And is that the meeting where the speech by Mr. Laski was delivered by radio from London? Do you remember that?

Mr. FOSTER. No; that was a different meeting.

Mr. ADAMSON. Which meeting was that, that you have in mind? Maybe we are not talking about the same meeting.

Mr. FOSTER. I guess not. The meeting that I spoke at was a Communist Party meeting.

Mr. ADAMSON. On what date?

Mr. FOSTER. I could not say the date. It was some months ago.

Mr. ADAMSON. Did you attend the meeting of September 24th, the meeting where Mr. Laski's speech was transmitted by radio?

Mr. FOSTER. No. What is that your affair, whether I attended it or not?

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to know whether you had any part in the management of the meeting.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a right to attend any meeting I please, and it is none of your business whether I attended it or not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, did you have any part in the arrangements for the meeting?

Mr. FOSTER. None whatever.

Mr. ADAMSON. And I believe that meeting was conducted under the auspices of the Spanish Relief Committee. Do you know that?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not. You had better ask them.

Mr. ADAMSON. Are you acquainted with that organization?

Mr. FOSTER. I have heard of it in a general way.

Mr. ADAMSON. You don't know, then, what the details were on the arrangement of the meeting on September 24th?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you are not familiar with the organization known as the Spanish Relief Committee?

Mr. FOSTER. Is that an un-American meeting, to meet to celebrate the Spanish revolt or Spanish struggle against Fascism? I should think the American people would be very proud of their part in such an affair.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, did you know before the meeting, or since the meeting, about Mr. Laski's speech attacking the Catholic Church?

Mr. FOSTER. I knew nothing about it. I read it in the paper the next day.

Mr. RANKIN. Who is Mr. Laski?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Laski is, I believe, one of the leaders in England of the Communist movement.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an example of how little you know about the Communist movement. Mr. Laski has nothing whatever to do with the Communist movement in England.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then will you tell us who Mr. Laski is?

Mr. FOSTER. He is one of the leaders of the Labor Party.

Mr. ADAMSON. Where, in England?

Mr. FOSTER. In England.

Mr. ADAMSON. And did you know anything at all about his speech before the meeting?

Mr. FOSTER. I answered that once, nothing.

Mr. ADAMSON. You only saw it in the newspaper after the meeting?

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. ADAMSON. And, as I understand it, Mr. Laski's speech was transmitted by radio to the United States. He was not here in person. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know. I read it in the newspapers. That is all I know about it.

Mr. ADAMSON. You referred to the purpose of the meeting. What do you understand the object of the meeting was?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't understand anything about it except in a general way; it was a Spanish relief meeting.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you have a copy of that Laski speech, Mr. Adamson?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I think we had better see what it is.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert a copy of Mr. Laski's remarks in the record here.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope Mr. Laski is not supposed to be un-American too. Is he?

Mr. ADAMSON. I don't know very much about Mr. Laski, Mr. Foster. You know more about him than I do.

Mr. RANKIN. Is he an American?

Mr. ADAMSON. No, sir; Mr. Laski is a politician in England, and we have received a copy of his speech.

Mr. RANKIN. What I want to know is how was his speech made in New York?

Mr. ADAMSON. Apparently it came by radio, and it is quite a mystery, Mr. Rankin, as to how they sandwiched it in at the right time, apparently it came over without censorship or regulation.

Mr. RANKIN. Have you a copy of his speech?

Mr. ADAMSON. We will have it here in a few minutes, Mr. Rankin. I will go along now, and when it comes in I will present it. I have seen a notice in the Daily Worker, Mr. Foster, which indicated that there is to be another big meeting in New York on November 14, at which Mr. Novikov, the Soviet Minister Counselor and the Under Secretary of State are scheduled to speak. Are you also going to speak at that meeting?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you know what the purpose of that meeting is?

Mr. FOSTER. I just know what I have read in the papers about it, that it is some sort of a meeting to cultivate American and Soviet friendship, which I think it a very patriotic endeavor.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, do I understand that you, as the titular head of the Communist Party, did not have any connection at all with the arranging this meeting?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. Who arranged it? Do you know?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no idea, beyond what I have read in the newspapers.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, if you have read the statements in the Daily Worker, I believe the last ad that I saw was signed by the Soviet-American Friends, or the Association for American and Soviet Friendship. What is the name of the organization? Do you know?

Mr. FOSTER. I could not tell you. It is something like that.

Mr. ADAMSON. I also noticed that the tickets were up as high as \$2.40 apiece. Did you notice that in the ad too?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I did not. But I don't see anything wrong about that. I see Republicans and Democrats holding meetings where they charge \$100 a throw to get in, or more. I think it is a very laudable thing to hold such meetings and to get the American people acquainted with our Allies.

Mr. ADAMSON. I recall that in your previous testimony you volunteered the information that religion in the Soviet Republic is absolutely unrestricted. I believe you said that there was no restraint on it.

Mr. FOSTER. I said something else too in my testimony, that I am not going to allow you to question me about religion, neither one way nor the other.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, you volunteered this information, and what I wanted to know was just what you could tell us of your own personal knowledge about that.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to tell you anything about it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then you volunteered the information before, Mr. Foster, and I thought you might be able now to enlighten us to the extent of your knowledge.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to.

Mr. ADAMSON. You refuse to answer that question?

Mr. FOSTER. I refuse to answer any questions with regard to religion, whatsoever, because I know the purpose of such questions, which is to create religious bigotry and division in the country, and I am not going to make myself a party to such a proposition.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you wish to retract the statement made at prior hearings concerning religion?

Mr. FOSTER. There is only one statement that I made that I wish to modify.

Mr. ADAMSON. What is that? Go ahead.

Mr. FOSTER. That is where I characterized the Truman Administration or President Truman as yielding to the pressure of the imperialists in the country. I wish to state instead that by his Navy Day speech I think the President has put himself at the head of the militant imperialists of the United States, and that the foreign policy that is now developing is highly dangerous to the peace of the world and to the objectives that we fought and won this great war for. That is the only modification of my testimony that I want to make.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, Mr. Foster, that is interesting, and I wonder if you would be good enough to tell us just briefly what you base that expression of opinion on? Why has the situation changed so suddenly?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, among other things I base it upon the situation in China. I think that our active support of the Chiang Kai Shek government, to the extent of intervening in the war, the civil war there against the Yunnan government, is an imperialist interference, that it is a danger to the peace in the Far East, and can well precipitate a serious civil war in China. In fact, it is my opinion that if it had not been for this active support of the Chiang Kai Shek government by the United States we would not have had even the situation that we have got now in China. I think it is none of our business how the Chinese people settle this affair, and that our job is to get our troops out of China as quickly as possible.

Mr. ADAMSON. When you refer to the Yunnan government you mean the Communist organization in China, don't you Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the Communists are leading it. It represents some 100 to 150 million Chinese. They are not all Communists. I wish they were, but unfortunately they are not. That is one example. I think also that our interference in the Balkans is an imperialist interference, and that it is unjustified from the

standpoint of American national interests. I think the policy that Mr. Byrnes has identified himself with there has been or is primarily an attempt to save what can be saved from the old and disastrous policy of surrounding the Soviet Union with a belt of hostile states, reactionary states.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you feel that the Administration has no right to interfere in any way in the Balkans?

Mr. FOSTER. I didn't say that. The United States has a perfect right under the arrangements that have been made to consult with the commissions and to work with the Soviet Union for the purpose of setting up democratic states in those areas, but not for building a series of reactionary states around the Soviet Union.

I think the experience in Finland and Hungary goes to prove conclusively that the Soviet Union, in so far as it has any influence in the matter, is building up, strengthening democracy and is not interfering with the democratic rights of these people.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Foster, since you have mentioned the Balkans, I want to show you an article that appeared this morning in one of the Washington papers. It is a dispatch by Larry Seur, one of the foreign correspondents, dated November 7, from Paris, and the headline reads "Terror Reigns in Balkan Area." The article contains the statement of several priests describing the death of 243 inmates of a monastery there.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't have to look at it. All I have to look at is the name of the paper, the Times-Herald. That tells the whole story. That tells the whole story. This is a sample of the war mongering that is being carried on by these papers against the Soviet Union. I want to say that from all the reliable information reaching the United States, that it is an unmitigated lie. The peaceful election in Hungary just a couple of days ago, or a few days ago, is the best answer to that, in which, instead of the Soviet Union forcing a Communist majority, as was alleged in such rags as this, actually the most conservative party in the country carried the majority of the votes, entirely without interference from the Soviet Union.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then your opinion is that Larry Seur's dispatch is false and unfounded?

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly. Not only false and unfounded, but it is deliberate war mongering as well, and this committee should not allow itself to be made a party to such action.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, Mr. Foster, aren't you being given full opportunity to express your opinion about the article? That doesn't make us a party to it.

Mr. FOSTER. That perhaps does not make you a party to it, but the mere fact that this committee can lend credence to such trash as that—and that is the stock in trade of this committee, apparently, from what has gone before—in fact, from the line of questioning that has been followed, undoubtedly this committee is displaying a strong anti-Soviet bias, and is lending itself to the war mongering propaganda that is now going on in the United States—in fact, it is cultivating it, and this is a danger to our country and to the rest of the world. Every war monger in the country is receiving inspiration and encouragement from this committee.

Mr. ADAMSON. Would you characterize the President's Navy Day speech then as war mongering?

Mr. FOSTER. I would characterize the President's Navy Day speech as an imperialist speech, a speech which is supporting those elements who are seeking to advance American interests—that is, what they consider to be American interests, what they pretend to be American interests—at the expense of many other nations of the world, and to the serious endangerment of peace and democracy and the prosperity that the American people are trying to build up in the aftermath of this war. And I have just given you an example about China, the peoples of the Far East, the colonial peoples who have been oppressed and exploited for so long by these imperialist powers are now determined to be free, and it is our job to help them to be free, in India and India-Asia and the Malayan areas and Indo-China and China; and our job, if we are to take seriously the purposes for which this great war has been won, is to lend our support to these forces, and not the reactionary forces that are trying to suppress and keep them in servitude, and if we attempt to do this, as we are now attempting to do in China, we will pay heavily for it. We will not advance our interests in the Far East.

Mr. RANKIN. Did the witness say he objects to the United States aiding Chiang Kai Shek in this war?

Mr. FOSTER. The war is over, I believe.

Mr. RANKIN. I mean during the war.

Mr. FOSTER. During the war we all worked together, Chiang Kai Shek's government, the Communist government—the Communists in China did 10 times the fighting that the Chiang Kai Shek government did, but the Chiang Kai Shek government was a part of the combination that carried through the war. And we are not raising objections on that score. We are speaking particularly now in the aftermath of the war, where the Chiang Kai Shek government is trying to set up a reactionary dictatorship in China, in the face of the opposition of the masses of the Chinese people. And he will not succeed, not even with our help, and I hope that the Administration will show intelligence enough to pull our troops out of China, where they have no business participating in this Chinese war.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, Mr. Foster, if this then supplies and sends relief in one form or another to China, which organization or group would you turn the material over to? What are you going to do about that?

Mr. FOSTER. We have no business sending what you call "supplies"—I assume that is military supplies. The war is over. When we cut off our lend-lease to Soviet Russia, when we cut off our lend-lease to Great Britain we cut it off all over the world, and we should cut it off to China as well. And the excuse that American troops are needed in China in order to secure the surrender of the Japanese is a lot of nonsense. The Japanese have surrendered, and all we are doing is trying to buttress up this shaky Chiang Kai Shek government.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that the President has ordered the withdrawal of the United States Marines from China.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope so. The progressive people of America will applaud him for doing so. We have no business there. Not only that, but should not give the Chiang Kai Shek government active support in any way that will stimulate this civil war in China. I think it is to America's interest that this matter be adjusted, and I think furthermore that we ought to pull General Wedemeyer out of there, who is a reactionary trouble maker. We ought to pull Ambassador Hurley out of there, who is also a trouble maker.

Mr. RANKIN. The United States has recognized the Chiang Kai Shek government, has it now?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you think we should break off relations with Chiang Kai Shek?

Mr. FOSTER. I didn't say that. I said we should not lend support in any way, shape or form, morally, financially, physically, militarily or of any kind, to the Chiang Kai Shek government against the masses of the Chinese people. That is what it amounts to at the present time.

Mr. RANKIN. You say "moral support"? Do you think we should continue to recognize them?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't think we should encourage the Chiang Kai Shek government in our press or by the promises of loans or any other way that will lead him to continue—lead that government to continue this civil war, but on the contrary, the administration should speak out clearly that it is the will of the American people—and I am sure it is the will of the American people, if you listen to the radio and if you read the newspapers—that this civil war be averted, and that unity be established with China. It is to the interest of the Chinese people, it is to our interest, that there be a stable, democratic government established there as quickly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. I was intrigued by your statement a while ago that you think we should withdraw Mr. Hurley as our Ambassador to China. Would you replace him with anybody else?

Mr. FOSTER. I think we should send an Ambassador there.

The CHAIRMAN. And we should maintain diplomatic relations with that government?

Mr. FOSTER. With the Chiang Kai Shek government. That is the legally recognized government. But I think we should send a progressive Ambassador who, instead of lending his activities to policies that have produced this civil war, we should set out to bring about unity in China, and I am sure that if the administration of our country really set on a determined policy of helping the Chinese people to unify their government, it would succeed.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood a minute ago that you spoke critically of the American Government seeking to advance the interests of the United States

at the expense of other nations. Do you consider that to be the object of the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. That the United States should advance its interests at the expense of other people?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. No; I think that is a very un-American policy. That is contrary to the interests of the American people. We are living in a world where we have got to cooperate with the other nations, and this can only be done on a give-and-take basis. It cannot be done on the basis of the United States attempting to boss the world, and that is our policy at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. How far would you go, then, to the extent of seeing to it that the American people are in no better condition economically than the other nations of the world?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you make a balance in standards of living?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the American people have no need whatsoever to sacrifice their standards of living. If intelligent policies of collaboration are developed with other nations, instead of us sacrificing our standards of living, undoubtedly we could improve them. Because if we do not develop this collaboration, you may be sure that we are going to be in for an economic crisis that will ruin the standards of living that we have achieved in this country. We must work with these people for our own benefit.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, are you acquainted with any of the officials who have been sent to this country by the Soviet Government to take over the property and assets of the old Russian Orthodox Church here?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you don't know, then, whether they are members of the Communist Party or what they do?

Mr. FOSTER. I haven't the slightest—I object to such questioning. It is none of my business whether they are members of the Communist Party or not, and I don't think it is any of yours.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, it might be, Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, ask them, then. They are competent to tell you. I don't know whether they are members of the Communist Party, and if I knew I wouldn't tell you.

Mr. ADAMSON. What is the present machinery or contact with the Communist Party in the Soviet Union today?

Mr. FOSTER. Contact by whom?

Mr. ADAMSON. You are one of the officials of the party. Let us say you.

Mr. FOSTER. What contacts the American Communist Party has with the Soviet Communist Party?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. None whatsoever.

Mr. ADAMSON. You have no communication with them at all? Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Browder told us that prior to the formation of the Communist Association in 1943 there was such international organization between all the Communist parties of the world, but I believe he also said that since 1943 there had been none. Do you agree with him on that?

Mr. FOSTER. Prior to 1943 there used to exist a Communist International. It has been liquidated.

Mr. ADAMSON. And I wonder if you could explain to the committee the mechanics of liquidation? How was it liquidated, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, as I remember, the executive committee made a statement that if the Comintern should be liquidated, and the various parties voted to liquidate it, and that settled it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do you mean the party in the United States voted on that question?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it did not. We had disaffiliated from the Comintern 2 or 3 years prior to that.

Mr. ADAMSON. About what date was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I can't say offhand. I think it was in 1940 or 1941.

Mr. ADAMSON. And was there a central committee in Moscow that handled the relationships between the parties in the various countries?

Mr. FOSTER. During the days of the Communist International?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is a matter of public knowledge.

Mr. ADAMSON. I suppose you are quite familiar with this book entitled "History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik). Edited by a Commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, Soviet Union, and authorized by the Central Committee." Was that the governing organization?

Mr. FOSTER. May I see it? [Mr. Adamson handed the book to Mr. Foster.] Governing organization of what?

Mr. ADAMSON. Of the international relations between the Communist Party?

Mr. FOSTER. No; from the text there it says a committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then this committee had nothing to do with the so-called Comintern? Is that right?

Mr. FOSTER. Only to the extent that it was affiliated with it, like all the rest of the Communist parties of the world.

Mr. ADAMSON. It was just one branch of their activities, then?

Mr. FOSTER. It was a member party.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Browder and Mr. Stachel both told us that they still regarded the Soviet Government as the greatest and most reliable government in the world. I believe their language was "the greatest and most reliable government of the United Nations." Do you agree with that?

Mr. FOSTER. Reliable in what sense?

Mr. ADAMSON. I don't know. I remember they said "the greatest and most reliable of all the United Nations."

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if you are implying "reliable" in the sense of developing democracy, then the answer is "yes." Any socialist government is more definitely and fundamentally a government for peace than any capitalist government, and inasmuch as there is only one socialist government, that is the most reliable government from a peace standpoint of any government in the world. If you mean the most reliable in the sense of fighting against Fascism, the same thing is true. A socialist government can be depended upon definitely to be the firmest and most reliable element in the struggle against Fascism, and far more so than any capitalist government. Whatever other way you mean—reliable in the sense of solving the problem of full employment? It will solve the problem of full employment—well, why not solve it, we will not solve it. We are not moving to the solution of the problem of full employment, principally because the great employers of the country don't want to solve it. They want 10 or 15 million unemployed workers in the country, so that they can weaken the trade unions, so that they can play Negro against white, so they can play veteran against worker, and reduce the living standards of the workers. These kinds of things will not exist in a socialist country, of which there is only one as yet, namely, the Soviet Union. They will solve these problems, and in this sense they are the most reliable. If you mean reliable in the sense of establishing good relations between the different national elements in the country, this is also the case.

The greatest scandal, the blackest mark on our civilization at the present time is the outrageous condition in which the 13,000,000 people of our country are kept, and members of this committee are sharing very definitely in keeping the Negro in this situation. Such a thing is absolutely nonexistent in the Soviet Union. There the nations live on the basis of absolute equality. Or on the question of antisemitism, our country now, unfortunately, is infected by this virus of antisemitism to a degree that it is a national danger. Yes, and Mr. Rankin sitting here has lent his high position definitely to the cultivation of antisemitism and anti-Negroism.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, that statement, of course, is not true.

Mr. FOSTER. If you are ashamed of it, Mr. Rankin, you should tell America that you are ashamed of it, not try to wiggle out of it here.

The CHAIRMAN. You will answer questions, Mr. Foster, and not state your opinions with reference to members of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. But, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, Mr. Rankin is a national leader.

The CHAIRMAN. I prefer that you do not use the name of any member of this committee in your criticisms.

Mr. FOSTER. They use my name. My name is as good as Rankin's, I hope.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster—

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). Just a minute. I haven't finished this point. On this question of antisemitism and anti-Negroism, such things are absolutely prohibited and nonexistent in the Soviet Union. Those things are a crime in the Soviet Union, and on such matters certainly the Soviet Union is the most reliable country in the world.

Mr. ADAMSON. And if a Negro stood up in the Soviet Union and opposed the Soviet Government or Communist Party, he would be nonexistent pretty quick too, wouldn't he?

Mr. FOSTER. That is one of these assertions that can not be substantiated.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, you said so, as long as you are on that——

Mr. FOSTER (interposing). I may say that if a Negro in the Soviet Union was to stand up and oppose the Soviet Government, under which for the first time in his life he was really treated as a man and as an equal, and if he opposed it the people would think he was crazy.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Foster, just let me refresh your recollection. In 1930, when you were testifying before a committee, Mr. Nelson asked you this question:

"If any man would rise up on the street corner in Russia and inveigh against the Soviet Government, he would be taken out and shot. What about that, Mr. Foster?"

"Mr. FOSTER. Yes. I will explain that. The situation of the Soviet Union is quite different from the situation in the United States. In the United States the whole productive processes, the industries, are owned by private capitalists and exploited for the benefit of a small ruling group of capitalists, and the government is the instrument for maintaining this exploitation in which millions of workers are exploited and forced into unemployment and the conditions they comprehend. In the Soviet Union the industries are owned by the workers, the government is their government and is carried on for the benefit of the masses. In America the worker who stands up and proposes the advocacy of the Soviet form of government and the struggle for the improvement of his condition, is taking a stand on the side not only of the interests of the working class but of the whole progress of human society, but the man who rises, the capitalist agent who arises in the Soviet Union and proposes the overthrow of the Soviet government and to reestablish capitalism there, proposes to turn the wheels of society backwards. The worker in America who fights the program of the Communist party, fights for the progress of society in general. The capitalist who proposes the overthrow of the Soviet government is the enemy of human society."

Is your opinion still the same, that anyone who would stand up and criticize the Communist Party in Russia would automatically back the capitalists and be shot?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will you explain your change of heart on that, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. First of all, I have had no change of heart. But what is all this about the complexion of the Soviet Government?

Mr. RANKIN. I have listened with deep interest to this testimony. Now I have several questions I want to ask you about it.

Mr. FOSTER. I made these remarks in answer to direct questions. If you want me to enlarge here upon the system of socialism in the Soviet Union, I will be glad to do so.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, why not talk about the question of personal liberty, the thing that we started out on? In this country you can stand up and criticize the Government all you want to, can't you, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. ADAMSON. You make speeches all the time, don't you? You called the President of the United States the No. 1 imperialist today.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; and you see what I get for it. I am haled before this committee and badgered day after day and pilloried all over the country as being un-American. That is what I get for saying things which members of this committee have admitted were perfectly legal to say.

Mr. ADAMSON. And you will be able to sell more pamphlets and books, won't you?

Mr. FOSTER. What about that? What is the implication of that?

Mr. ADAMSON. Tell us how it is hurting you.

Mr. FOSTER. Because the workers—I will tell you how it is hurting me and how it is hurting the workers of this country. This system of red baiting that this committee is organizing and is the chief spearhead for that in the United States, is one of the greatest social menaces in our country. It serves

to cultivate precisely those ideas of antisemitism and Fascism, anti-Negroism, the very ideas that Hitler came to power on, by inculcating them in the minds of the people. You attempt to call me here and put me on the spot—as un-American. I want to reply to that by saying that I consider the most un-American institution in America is precisely this committee here, and if it wants to do a patriotic service to our country it should dissolve itself and let us be done forever with this shameless succession of witch-hunting committees that are a disgrace to our American democracy.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let me call your attention, Mr. Foster, to a magazine with which I am sure you are familiar.

Mr. MUNDT. Before you get to another point I would like to have Mr. Foster answer your other question. He said that in Russia if somebody stood up and opposed the Government, as he can do here, he would be shot.

Mr. ADAMSON. That's right.

Mr. MUNDT. Here all that happens is that he is hauled before the committee, explains himself, and then he goes out and criticizes the Government some more, and that is perfectly legal in America and we would not restrain him from doing it. I would like to know what he means by having greater liberty in Russia by being shot.

Mr. ADAMSON. I assumed he didn't want to answer the question directly.

Mr. FOSTER. I will be very pleased to answer that question. This raises the whole question of democracy. You want me to enlarge upon democracy in the Soviet Union?

Mr. MUNDT. I would like to have you enlarge now on your claim that a government where a man will be shot if he criticizes the government is a better government than one where he can say anything he likes and nothing will be done about it.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to state that democracy in a socialist country, in any socialist country, must be superior to the democracy in any capitalist country, and inasmuch as there is only one socialist country, that applies to that particular country. One of the supreme examples of democracy is precisely the regulations or the attitude of the people toward the question of various races or nationalities that make up the people, something that we should learn from. The supreme expression of democracy entirely over all is precisely the ownership of the great industries of the country by the people of the country.

Mr. MUNDT. You haven't asked the question about the man being shot for standing on a street corner and attacking the government. You think that is a better government than one where he can say what he pleases and nothing is done about it?

Mr. FOSTER. I want to answer that as follows—

Mr. MUNDT. (interposing). Answer it "yes" or "no," then elaborate with your speech afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. Anybody who would stand up—any man who would stand up in the street in Moscow and advocate the return of capitalism would be looked upon as a nut.

Mr. MUNDT. And he would be shot.

Mr. FOSTER. He would not be shot either.

Mr. MUNDT. I thought you said he would be shot.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I did not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, you did.

Mr. MUNDT. Will you read his statement?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course I didn't say such a thing. The fact of the matter is for many years after the Revolution people advocated the return to capitalism freely in the Soviet Union.

Mr. MUNDT. And a lot of them were shot after the purge trials in Moscow.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir. Not only that, but they deserved to be shot. They were traitors to their country. One of the greatest political events in modern history was precisely those so-called "purge" trials in Moscow. That is what strengthened the Russian people and strengthened the Russian arms. If the leaders—just a minute now—I am talking—if the leaders of the Spanish Republic had had the intelligence that the leaders of the Soviet Republic had, and eliminated the Francos and other traitors who are trying to overthrow their government and set up a Fascist regime, the whole history of Europe would have been different. Yes, it was to our interest as Americans that this purge was carried through, and it will stand out in history as one of the greatest blows that was struck for liberty in our time, particularly this purge in the

Soviet Union, and I thought that the intelligent people of America had finally come to understand that that was so.

Mr. MUNDT. If you advocate the theory that you can strengthen the system of government by shooting all the people who oppose it, by that same theory you should shoot in this country all the people who oppose the present Administration? You would be in favor of that?

Mr. FOSTER. These people did not oppose the Soviet form of government. What they did was to set up connections with Germany and Japan, and were organizing a conspiracy to overthrow the Soviet Government by armed force.

Mr. MUNDT. What was the date of these purge trials?

Mr. FOSTER. The date of them was the latter part of the 30's. And it was that precisely that steeled and armed the Soviet people and unified them by cleansing their ranks of these traitorous elements, that enabled them to make the great stand that they did. We were fed in this country on lies in this paper that your attorney has used authoritatively here, this Times-Herald and others, lies that the Soviet Government had gotten rid of all—had purged all its competent generals. Well, it looked as though they must have left plenty of good ones, judging by the military record they made during the war.

Mr. MUNDT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the counsel be permitted to read again Mr. Foster's statement about how they preserve civil liberties in a government by shooting those who oppose it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Why not let Mr. Foster read it?

Mr. FOSTER. You read all right. You are doing very well.

Mr. ADAMSON. You are much more eloquent than I.

Mr. FOSTER. No; I don't want to read it.

Mr. ADAMSON. This is from page 376 of part 1 of the House hearings, Investigation of Communist Propaganda.

Mr. RANKIN. What date?

Mr. ADAMSON. That was the Fish committee hearings, held June 9 and 13, 1930, Seventy-first Congress, second session, pursuant to House Resolution No. 20. Mr. Foster testified, and that is the statement I have read to Mr. Foster. It is on page 376.

Mr. MUNDT. Read it again. I think it ought to go into the record again.

Mr. ADAMSON (reading):

"Mr. NELSON. If we are correctly informed, any man who would rise on the street corner in 'Russia and inveigh against the Soviet Government would be taken out and shot.' What about that?"

"Mr. FOSTER. Yes. I will explain that."

And then he went into the long explanation that I read.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that is perfectly obvious. I said I would explain it, which signified a willingness to explain the situation, not agreement with the idea that people should be shot for advocating capitalism in the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you now, Mr. Foster, embrace any different ideas than that expressed in the excerpt read a while ago?

Mr. FOSTER. No; substantially that is correct, but certainly not with the distortion that your attorney attempts to put on it, that it is an agreement that people should be shot.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be put into the record.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, you said to Mr. Mundt here that some of these people who were purged were shot because they had entered into some relationship with Germany. If my memory serves right, didn't the Soviet Government enter into a very definite relationship with Germany around 1938 or 1939?

Mr. FOSTER. There we go again, another corpse disinterred.

Mr. MUNDT. I just want to get the thing straightened out here. You say they had a right to shoot these other people for the same thing.

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to your question I will reply shortly that I think it is the consensus of opinion of the most intelligent Americans, those who know what is going on in the world, that the Soviet-German pact, by giving the Soviet Government an opportunity to strengthen its forces, was one of the most decisive contributing factors to the winning of this war.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, are you familiar with the magazine, Political Affairs?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Of which, I believe, Eugene Dennis is the editor, and V. J. Jerome is the managing editor, and it says here "A magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxism and Leninism."

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. As a matter of fact, you contribute to that magazine, don't you, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. Occasionally.

Mr. ADAMSON. And the October issue—

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). Just a moment at this point. I think the record ought to show that during the time that this Soviet-German pact was made—shortly after it was made, and while it was in existence, Germany attacked Poland, and incidentally the war broke out between the western Allies and Germany.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, Mr. Rankin, if my memory serves me right, and subject to correction by Mr. Foster, I think that Germany and Russia invaded Poland simultaneously, one from the east and one from the west.

Mr. RANKIN. I think Germany invaded first. That is my recollection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Maybe a couple of days ahead of Russia, but if my memory serves me right, the Russian army moved into Poland from the east, didn't they, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. And that is another thing that I think the military experts in the war are agreed upon precisely, that the advance of the Red Army half way across Poland was one of the major strategical moves that tended to break the offensive of the German army, by providing two or three hundred additional miles to cushion the initial shock of the Germany army in its drive against Moscow. If the Russians had not taken over eastern Poland, Hitler would have taken it and would have been that much stronger.

Mr. RANKIN. There was no move on the part of Russia to join the Allies until Germany attacked Russia, as I remember.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is right.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not true. The fact of the matter is that as far back as 1935, and even earlier in the League of Nations, the Soviet Government raised the issue of an international peace front of democratic countries to prevent the incursions of the Fascist Germany and militaristic Japan, and if the countries, Great Britain, France, and the United States, had joined with the Soviet Union at that time, Fascism would have been nipped in the bud and this great war would have been averted. But unfortunately the reactionaries controlling the British Government and the French Government, supported by our full reactionary forces in the United States, had a different idea, namely, of stimulating Germany to attack the Soviet Union. The record of the Soviet Union has been one of active cooperation with the democratic peoples all the way through, and in fact, right up to the very outbreak of the war the Soviet government was cooperating with the democratic countries, and only when it saw that they had no intention of attempting to stop Hitler was the pact formed. According to Benes, the head of the Czechoslovak Government, the Soviet Government proposed itself alone to come to the aid of Czechoslovakia after it had been abandoned by the western powers at Munich.

Mr. MUNDT. That was when?

Mr. FOSTER. That was in 1938.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it your position and contention that President Roosevelt was reactionary?

Mr. FOSTER. President Roosevelt was a great liberal, one of the great liberals of our period, but it is a matter of common knowledge, I think, that President Roosevelt was subject to a great reactionary pressure in Congress—not to say that he also did not make some mistakes himself and carry out some conservative policies, but he was pressed by these reactionary forces in Congress, and undoubtedly was pushed into numerous policies that he otherwise would not have gone into.

Mr. MUNDT. That was not a congressional act. That was an Executive act. You might hold that President Roosevelt was a great liberal in the clutches of such reactionaries as Henry Wallace and Harry Hopkins, perhaps. They were advising him at the time.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't think that the Executive is divorced from the legislative branch of our Government, and it is simply ridiculous to assume that the Executive can carry on a policy independent of Congress.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, Mr. Foster, following Mr. Mundt's question, isn't it true that Mr. Molotov made a very dramatic speech shortly after the pact was signed between Russia and Germany, in which he said that Germany is in the position of a state striving for the earliest termination of war and for peace, while

Britain and France "which only yesterday were declaring against aggression, are in favor of continuing the war and are opposed to the conclusion of peace"?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I protest against this line of questioning.

Mr. ADAMSON. You have expressed an opinion here that that pact was in the interest of America.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I express no opinions except when I am pressed by you. I want to insist that this whole line of questioning is designed, deliberately designed, to furnish the Soviet haters of America with material with which to poison the minds of the American people and to develop a war spirit in our country, and I resent being called upon to answer any questions along this line, not because I do not feel competent to answer them, but because I refuse to be, even indirectly, a party to such war mongering as the line of your questioning implies.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let me read you something, here, Mr. Foster.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I think that somebody ought to speak out at this point. Certainly it is my view, and I think the view of every member of the committee, that we do not want any war with Russia. We do not want any war with anybody else.

Mr. FOSTER. But you are heading—the whole purpose of this questioning is to cultivate such a spirit.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not asking these questions, but I just don't want it to be stated in this record that the members of Congress and the President or the leaders of this country want a war with anybody at this time. We have had enough war. What we want now is peace and prosperity throughout the world.

Mr. FOSTER. Why don't you suppress this line of war-mongering questioning then?

Mr. RANKIN. Because I think his questions are a matter with the counsel himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but the counsel is not an independent agent. If he is asking irresponsible questions—as he is—it is the duty of the chairman to call him to order and suppress those questions as a menace to the interests of our country and the peace of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Your statement is then that you prefer not to reply to the question at all?

Mr. FOSTER. Because it is a war-mongering question, and it speeds propaganda, like Gerald K. Smith and Father Coughlin, and other elements like that.

The CHAIRMAN. You have stated your reason?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Foster, let me read to you a paragraph from this magazine here, which—by the way, you are one of the contributors this month.

Mr. RANKIN. What is that magazine?

Mr. ADAMSON. This is the magazine, Political Affairs, and I am reading—

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). Where is it published? Who is the editor?

Mr. ADAMSON. It is published in New York, and it is a magazine devoted to the theory and precepts of Marxism and Leninism, and I am reading from page 875:

"The American people must therefore conclude that while the United States can easily dispense with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, it cannot afford to do without the American Communist Party, least of all now, when all the signs point to stormy weather ahead. The responsibility for giving our country the stronger, more united, independent Marxist party its needs rests squarely upon our shoulders."

Now, Mr. Foster, I assume that you are familiar with that article and that that summarizes your attitude too?

Mr. FOSTER. 100 percent. I say the Communist Party in the United States—that is for the quotation. I don't know the whole article—the Communist Party of the United States will be flourishing and growing and prospering when this Un-American Committee is just a sad memory that the American people will try to forget about.

Mr. MUNDT. Especially this committee.

Mr. FOSTER. This committee like all the rest of them. I think the House, particularly the House, is infected with this disease of setting up un-American committees. Why don't they look at what is happening in the world? Look at the New York elections. They tried to settle that on the basis of red baiting, and they got kicked in the face by the voters of New York. I told you that Rankin wouldn't get away with it, and he didn't get away with it

in New York either, nor anywhere else. This red baiting has been good, but the old gray mare isn't what she used to be. It comes as a great surprise that the peoples of the world are waking up, are beginning to see through this Hitlerian tactic of red baiting. But they are learning just the same.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any other questions?

Mr. ADAMSON. Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That Mr. Foster can answer briefly? We are going to have to adjourn very soon.

Mr. ADAMSON. This magazine article further states, Mr. Foster:

"The secret of our strength and dynamic vitality is indeed to be learned from a study of the Marxist-Leninist science by which we live."

Is that also in accord with your views?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. ADAMSON. And I also note in the magazine here several statements which bear directly on your expressions here today. Apparently the only interest expressed by these writers in the Negro or the Jewish race are for the purpose exclusively of indoctrinating them with Communism and rallying them to support your organization. Isn't that true? Isn't that your only interest?

Mr. FOSTER. I didn't get that.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, for example, "We must continue the trend in training Negroes and Marxist-Leninist teachers."

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Is that your only interest in them?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course not.

Mr. ADAMSON. No?

Mr. FOSTER. Our first and primary interest in the Negro people is to win them the position of full citizenship under the American Constitution and our democratic institutions, the right to work, the right to live, full economic, political and social equality with all the people of America. This is our principal object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman. I move that we go into executive session. It is nearly 12 o'clock. We will have to be on the floor at 12, and we have some things that we want to discuss here.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. FOSTER. Am I finished, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, would you mind waiting for just a few minutes outside?

Mr. ADAMSON. Before we adjourn, I will place in the record the address by Mr. Harold Laski, delivered September 24, 1945.

(The paper referred to appears in the appendix as exhibit No. 9.)

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a. m., the committee went into executive session, at the conclusion of which the committee adjourned.)

EXHIBIT 9

ADDRESS BY PROFESSOR HAROLD LASKI

September 24, 1945, 9:30 p. m. E. W. T.

[Recorded at American Broadcast Co. News Room, New York]

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful to your committee for enabling me to take part in your meeting tonight. Of course, I speak to you in a purely personal capacity, as a British private citizen speaking to American private citizens. But I think and I hope that I speak that is thought to be the overwhelming majority of liberal minded people in this country.

The cause of Republican Spain has come to be in this generation what the liberation of the Russian people was in the harsh days of Czarist tyranny. It is one of the supreme tests of our devotion to freedom. We in Britain and you in the United States have a heavy debt to Republican Spain, negatively at least. Our timidity made possible the victory of France. Our statesmen hid beneath a veil of hypocrisy not only their own disregard for truth and justice

but their willingness to allow a whole people to be crucified in the service of appeasement. At no time can they have been aware that Hitler and Mussolini were deliberately making Spain a theatre of experiment for the Second World War. At no time either can they have failed to know that nonintervention was a tragic farce, intended to assure victory to a rebellious general who symbolized in himself all the main elements of brutal reaction. They must have known, too, that both psychologically and politically the victory of France in which they were partners—even if they were silent partners—was an important milestone on the road to the Second World War.

Now that grim struggle has ended in the victory of the United Nations. But Mr. Chairman, the Spanish people still remain in Franco's prison. No honest observer anywhere can deny that a regime like his makes it impossible for the ordinary citizen of Spain to have access to any one of the four freedoms. Executions still continue on a massive scale. Torture is still a common feature when supporters of the Republic fall into the hands of the political police. The prisons are still full of men and women whose only crime is that they dreamed of what you and I dream, of their right to be free. Most of what there was of thought and ideas in Spain is now either dead or in that grim poverty which is haunted by the endless frustration of political exiles.

Everyone knows that Franco's regime has been a massive failure—corrupt and cruel and ignorant—that it has no support from any interest in Spain itself which is entitled to self-respect. And everyone knows, too, that throughout the World War he was the fawning satellite of Hitler and Mussolini, the servant of their effort, the enthusiast of their purpose, and that the only reason which kept Spain a formal neutral in the European struggle was Franco's fear of what might happen to him if he put arms in the hands of the Spanish people. I do not share the view of those who think we should be grateful because at a critical time he did not complicate our strategic problems in the Mediterranean. His motive was not good will, but fear, the knowledge that his power hung by a thread. He showed his own attitude unmistakably when he sent the Blue Division to fight against the Soviet Union. Franco was neutral because he was afraid. But at a nod from his Nazi and Fascist masters, does anyone doubt that he would have laid Spain at their feet. The neutrality of cringing cowardice is no sort of title to the respect of free people—least of all when it is permeated with ill will to every principle of freedom.

What then, with our victory, Mr. Chairman, is to be our policy in Spain? Are we to allow the tragedy to go unmitigated in its barbarism, while governments sigh that they are not their brother's keeper? Does anyone honestly think that the Spain Franco has made can be other than a poison in the fellowship of Peoples? Isn't it obvious that there will come a stage when its yoke will be found intolerable, and that it will provoke a new and more barbarous war? And is that not the alternative if we continue the policy of silent inaction, that Franco will do some sort of deal with one or other of the claimants to the Spanish throne, and that perhaps after a fake plebescite has been staged we shall be told that the monarchy has been restored by the free choice of the Spanish people? A Spanish monarchy for what and for whom? Is a monarchy issuing from some ugly deal with Franco or the Falangists likely to tackle agrarian reform? Is it likely to prevent the Roman Catholic Church in Spain from remaining a rich monopoly at the expense of mass poverty? Is there any prospect that a successor, perhaps a son of Alfonso XIII, will give the effort proportionate to the need in things like education or health or housing, or that wholesale destruction of special privilege, which has been the historic curse of Spain? Can anyone see a Spanish king even attempting to make his army anything more than an instrument of the protection of vested interests and a ready weapon of popular repression? Merely to ask these questions is to answer them.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that our duty is to withdraw recognition from France. It is in exile; the Republic is still in being. The Cortes has met; it has elected a President. I do not doubt that given the good will and the aid of the United Nations, the controversies inevitable to an emigration can be overcome, and there can emerge a united government of all the popular forces which, with our backing, would swiftly break through the trembling hold of Franco and his supporters upon that power they have so consistently abused. Let me add that the Republican Government would be built out of men and women who have proved, like Negrin and Fernando de las Rios and Palancia, their devotion to the cause of freedom and Democracy in Spain.

And if it be said that recognition of the Republic will be the signal for a civil war in Spain, there are two sufficient answers. The first is that the Potsdam conference has already refused Franco Spain any right into the new world organization. If that isn't an invitation to the Spanish people to overthrow Franco, I don't know what it means. And the second is that if we had not invented the doctrine of nonintervention—a dishonest invention and still more dishonestly applied by Great Britain and America—the Spanish Republic would still be in power today. We must pay the price of our tacit connivance at its assassination. I ask you to remember that we have always intervened in this war when we thought our interests required it—Iceland, Greenland, Persia, the Azores, British policy in Greece, Russian policy in Finland and the Balkans. They are impressive enough illustrations of this theme.

Do we pursue a policy of watchful waiting out of respect for the official view of the State Department in Washington or the Foreign Office in London, or are we afraid of the hostility of the Vatican to our support of a democratic resurgence in Spain? Or are we hoping that we can build there a foundation for the kind of monarchy symbolized by King George of the Hellenes or the House of Savoy in Italy—monarchies incapable of roots in democratic constitutionalism, because their past has made the acceptance of their bonafides impossible by any democratic citizen, British or American, with self-respect. Do our governments expect us to show any enthusiasms for a monarchy that would be comprised before it began to rule? I hope I can say with confidence that neither President Truman and Mr. Byrnes nor Premier Attlee and Mr. Bevin think so little of our intelligence as to assume that we can be fooled so simply. Our peoples did not make the immense sacrifices of this war to perpetuate either a tyranny like that of Franco or an unedifying mythology like a Vatican-sponsored King of Spain, trying hastily to learn the vocabulary of the Four Freedoms, while making it painfully evident that the words have no meaning for him.

It's time democratic powers became the trustees of Democracy. It's time that they regarded their trusteeship not as a thing of which they are ashamed, but as a thing of which they can be proud. The post war world will be more endure part democratic, part Fascist that the United States could have endured half slave and half free. As Lincoln said, on the eve of your civil war, "It must be all one thing or all the other." We ought to have learned pretty properly the habits of tyranny from our experience of the interwar years. Don't let us forget that it is a weed that grows in every corner. Don't let us forget either, the lessons stamped so ineffaceably on our generation that if we acquiesce in tyranny abroad, sooner or later we become blind to its slow and persistent growth at home.

Every influence which bids us avert our eyes from the Spanish scene is an influence that always seeks to limit the boundaries of freedom everywhere among ourselves. This is a moment not for inertia but for action. Let us be sure that what we do to and for the Spanish people we do to and for ourselves. The chance is there—the duty is clear. The influence of a bold policy will be wide and wholesome. It is not a chance that we can evade, neither America nor Britain. It is not a chance our governments can evade, if they have any decent respect for the opinions of Mankind. Let us therefore go forward.

×





BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 2139

